AFIT/GLM/LAL/97S-1

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF LOGISTICS AND ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT

AIR FORCE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

CORE VALUES: A HISTORY OF VALUES-RELATED INITIATIVES IN THE AIR FORCE

by

Gregory J. Dierker, GS-12

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of Master of Science in Logistics Management

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio

September 1997

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author(s) and do not reflect the official policy or position of the US government or the Department of Defense. In accordance with Air Force Instruction 51-303, it is not copyrighted, but is the property of the United States government.

Contents

Page

Tables

Page

Acknowledgments

I am grateful for all the assistance and patience given me by my advisor, Dr. Craig M. Brandt, and my two readers, Dr. David K. Vaughan and Major William L. Scott. Their guidance was instrumental to the completion of this effort. The effort would also have not been possible without the information and contacts that were provided by Captain Steve Davis and Major Carl D. Rehberg. Captain Davis is currently the Honor Education Officer at the United States Air Force Academy. Major Rehberg previously held the same position at the Academy until June 1996. A special heartfelt thanks goes to my father and unofficial advisor, Ronald J. Dierker, or "Rumplestiltskin," for the many hours of review he provided.

I cannot adequately thank my family, especially my lovely wife, Melinda, and my four boys, Brendon, Lucas, Dominic and Kristopher for their patience and support during this challenging period. Daddy's home.

Most importantly, I would like to take this opportunity to give thanks and praise to my Lord and Savior, whom without, this lad would not have had the strength to finish this effort.

Gregory J. Dierker

Abstract

This research explored the historical Air Force values-related initiatives that have existed since its creation in 1947. The Air Force has long been interested in and conducted values-related initiatives, although sometimes with a different focus and objective than its preceding initiatives. This study specifically examines two of the assumptions made in the current Air Force Core Values initiative against the historic values-related initiatives to identify any differences that have occurred over time. The two assumptions specifically deal with the degree to which the initiatives emphasize character development, and secondly, the role the chaplain plays in these identified initiatives. Other attributes were also identified and compared across the initiatives. Information was also provided from other organizations external to the Air Force that are concerned with character development. Historical and on-going initiatives from the United States Air Force Academy were also identified and compared against the current initiative. The research analysis identified a number of issues where significant differences exist among the initiatives. These differences were classified into the "needs further clarification" category and recommended for further study. The primary findings were that there has been a clear lineage of values-related initiatives, there has been significant changes recently concerning a reduced emphasis on character development and the greatly reduced role that the chaplain plays in these values-related initiatives.

This difference appears to be related to the respective office upon which the implementation is assigned.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Overview

This thesis effort discusses the current United States Air Force (USAF) Core Values initiative and also identifies previous values-related initiatives within the USAF since its creation in 1947. Several other initiatives are briefly discussed in a broader context within the US military and US society. This study specifically examines several of the assumptions and a number of related attributes of the current initiative. The attributes of the current initiative were compared to the other historical values-related initiatives, as well as to initiatives being conducted at the Air Force Academy and to what is being emphasized in the private sector. The chapter also provides the objectives of the research, the questions that the research attempts to answer, the intended scope and limitations of the research, the methodology used, and the overall structure of the research report.

Introduction

The Air Force Core Values initiative is an attempt to communicate "the price of admission to the Air Force itself" and to "serve as a beacon vectoring us back to the path of professional conduct" (*United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet)*. The Core Values initiative was implemented under strong support of both the Secretary of the Air

Force, Dr. Sheila Widnall and then Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General Ronald Fogleman who directed all Air Force commanders to be engaged and committed to the process of communicating these values to their respective subordinate commanders. These subordinate commanders were then required to cascade this information through their organization until everyone had the training and received a copy of the Air Force Core Values booklet. This initiative is a follow-on to a previous Core Values initiative under General McPeak, whose planning began back in 1992. While the initiatives are related, it is interesting that there is no mention of the previous initiative in the Core Values booklet that is distributed. The booklet indicates that it is the "basic guide to the Air Force Core Values initiative" and that it was "designed to be brief, to the point and easy to carry." This research investigated two of the assumptions identified in the *United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet*. These assumptions are the first and the last of eight assumptions.

> 1. *The Core Values Strategy exists independently of and does not compete with Chapel programs*. {The Core Values Strategy attempts no explanation of the origin of the Values except to say that all of us, regardless of our religious views, must recognize their functional importance and accept them for that reason. Infusing the Core Values is necessary for successful mission accomplishment.} (*The United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet)*
>
> 8. *Our first task is to fix organizations; individual character development is possible, but it is not a goal*. {If a culture of compromise exists in the Air Force, then it is more likely to be the result of bad policies and programs than it is to be symptomatic of any character flaws in our people. Therefore, long before we seek to implement a character development program, we must thoroughly evaluate and, where necessary, fix our policies, processes, and procedures.} (*The United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet)*

These assumptions, along with the additional identified attributes of the initiative, are contrasted with previous USAF values-related initiatives and other literature to attempt to

solidify or clarify the intent and aid the understanding and acceptance of what initially appears to require further explanation. Several other USAF initiatives have been identified as well as relevant literature within the Department of Defense and other US sources involved with broader initiatives such as character development, leadership development, professional ethics and other relevant "people development" initiatives.

This research not only explores these similarities and differences between the current and previous Core Values initiatives, but it also assesses the presence of identified key attributes in the current and previous values-related initiatives that have been conducted since the creation of the Air Force.

Background

The Air Force introduced "The Little Blue Book" on Core Values on 1 January 1997 in an attempt to "infuse" common values into all Air Force personnel (Appendix A). The Air Force identified three core values which it felt were broad enough to cover a multitude of critical areas. These values include:

- Integrity first
- Service before self, and
- Excellence in all we do

Each of these three Core Values includes a number of additional traits that Air Force leadership strongly desires its employees to embrace. As an introduction, *The United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet*, otherwise referred to as the "*The Little Blue Book*" states,

> Whoever you are and wherever you fit on the Air Force team, this is your basic guide to the Air Force Core Values.

> The Core Values exist for all members of the Air Force family—officer, enlisted, and civilian; active, reserve, and retired; senior, junior, and middle management; civil servants; uniformed personnel; and contractors. They are for all of us to read, to understand, to live by, and to cherish.
>
> The Core Values are much more than minimum standards. They remind us of what it takes to get the mission done. They inspire us to do our very best at all times. They are the common bond among all comrades in arms, and they are the glue that unifies the force and ties us to the great warriors of the past.
>
> ***Integrity first, Service before self***, and ***Excellence in all we do***. These are the Air Force Core Values. Study them…understand them…follow them and encourage others to do the same. (*The United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet)*

Air Force leadership has shown strong support for this initiative as indicated in the 13 November 1996 memorandum to all major commands, field operating agencies, and direct reporting units (MAJCOM/FOA/DRU) Commanders (Appendix B). Senior Air Force leadership has also dedicated many hours delivering many speeches over the past several years on the subject of Core Values. Another indicator of the importance of the Core Values initiative, which also provides support that the initiative will not quickly go away, is the fact that Air Force leadership sees it as significant enough to discuss at length at two different places *in Global Engagement: A Vision for the 21st Century*. This document identifies where the Air Force is heading over the next several decades and provides insight on how it plans to get there. In addition to addressing Core Values as a foundation of quality people, this document lists the core competencies that include professional knowledge, airpower expertise, and technological know-how. To include details concerning the Core Values initiative in a long range planning document such as *Global Engagement* adds credibility to the importance Air Force senior leadership is placing on this effort. Additionally, the Secretary of the Air Force, Dr. Widnall, has stated, "In

essence they are the three pillars of professionalism that provide the foundation for military leadership at every level. They point to what is universal and unchanging in the profession of arms" (*The United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet)*. Further detail of these references are provided in Chapter IV.

The timing of the latest Core Values initiative is also very appropriate. Recent Air Force cases of adultery and disobedience to direct orders have made the national headline news. Although values have always been important to the military, *The United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet* refers to recent incidents such as the CT-43 and Fairchild B-52 crashes, the shootdown of the two Blackhawk helicopters over Iraq, adulterous fraternization, and contractor fraud and cost overruns as big ticket scandals that "grew out of a climate of ethical corrosion" as justification a renewed interest in core values. Major studies of ethics in the Air Force in 1983 and 1988 showed that over one-third of the Air Force personnel are convinced that integrity is a problem, and the lower the rank of the persons polled, the more convinced they are of the problem's existence (Lewallen, 1991:57-58).

The subject of Core Values is such a relevant topic that now is the appropriate time to allow for open discussions and further investigation concerning this subject. Two of the three recommendations from a earlier study entitled *Ethics in the US Air Force: 1988* are partially addressed by the Core Values initiative (1990:iii). The first recommendation included initiating "Project Bold Truth' and "Project Golden Truth" to reduce false reporting in operations, which is similar to what the Core Value of "Integrity first" strives to improve. The second recommendation was to "[e]stablish a task force to determine how best to teach ethics in the Air Force—outside of accession and formal PME

programs—without turning it into an irritant or a square filling exercise" (1990:iii). With respect to the second recommendation from this study, the current Core Values Working Group is attempting to achieve this objective. This study can also be used to enhance that effort. Further detail and definitions concerning *The United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet* are provided in Chapter II.

The Air Force is not the only service interested in establishing "Core Values." According to the *Army Times*, "The Army leadership, in the midst of a multifaceted project to instill "core values" throughout the service, hopes more enlisted soldiers will…emulate young George Washington rather than Beetle Bailey" (Willis, June 16, 1997:12). The article also stated that, "Soon the Army will field its Character Development XXI program, an effort to unify the teaching and make sure all soldiers start from a common set of core values" (Willis, June 16, 1997:12). As is similar with the Air Force, this concern towards values of all of the troops has not been the recent trend. According to the *Army Times*,

> Yet an Army-wide survey in 1996 showed most of the values instruction was directed primarily at officers, according to an official familiar with its results. Cadet Command and the academies had their own values curriculums, but there was no standard, and "the average Reserve Officers Training Corps instructor did whatever he came up with," the official said. (Willis, June 16, 1997:12)

The subject of who is responsible and best prepared to lead discussion and the respective values training is also an important issue. Although the Air Force has placed a high reliance on the chaplains in the past, their current role and involvement in the Core Values initiative is negligible, almost to the point of non-existent.

Another issue that has and will likely continue to come up in discussions across the Air Force is will such an initiative really be able to make an impact among individuals and their organizations? When dealing with the subject of values, is it necessary to teach them in terms of moral absolutes or are values relative? Should the values only be important to the degree that they "functionally" produce the results the organization is striving to obtain or are there black and white, right and wrong values towards which the Air Force should aspire? How will the Air Force be able to convince parties at both extremes of the continuum of the validity of the chosen value(s) without alienating them? Some individuals who believe in moral absolutes and yet find no mention of them in the document may be frustrated. Others do not believe that moral absolutes or the spiritual dimension is important when providing the basis for the chosen values. Still others may believe in moral absolutes and the importance of a spiritual foundation, but also believe that this spiritual basis should not be emphasized as it would "fly in the face" of our current ruling concerning the separation of church and state. As can be imagined, this can be a sensitive issue to many Air Force employees. Since it is generally conceded that the members of military services reflect the views and values of the society that they represent, this initiative must be kept in that context where appropriate.

Nord, author of *Religion and American Education*, provides one perspective of how this training needs to be handled. Nord believes that even if a consensus is reached as to what virtues and values to espouse, there may still be a problem with how those values are promoted. Nord quotes Charles Haynes, author of *Finding Common Ground*, who provides the following comments on core values, "teaching core values may not be done in such a way that as to suggest that religious authority is unnecessary or unimportant."

Indeed, character education "can be hollow and misleading when taught within a curriculum that is silent about religion." Hence, sound character education programs "will acknowledge that many people look to religious authority and revelation for moral guidance" (1995:340).

What are values and how important is the subject? According to United States Air Force Academy's Basic Cadet Training Honor Lessons, *values* are defined as:

> core beliefs or desires which guide or motivate attitudes and actions. They are the worth or priority we place on people, things, ideas. They are central beliefs that help determine how we will behave in certain situations. Some values concern beliefs about right and wrong, most do not. (11)

This same document differentiates this definition of values from the definition of ethical values. It defines ethical values as, "values that directly relate to beliefs concerning what is right and proper. They are deemed to have an obligation or stated another way: they are what we ought to do, not just what we want to do" (11).

The Civil Air Patrol in its training guide, *Values for Living and Ethics for Command*, quotes Col. D. M. Malone, "Of all the thousands of things that come under the heading of "Leadership," what is it that's 'most important'? Simple…soldiers' values" (1996:1).

Many programs and leaders have also long recognized the importance of character development in any effort where the inculcation of values is being attempted. Initiatives such as these ultimately strive to improve the overall character of each employee. The Civil Air Patrol's training booklet ties values and character in the following statement, "Values are what we hold as important. Character is who we are. Our core values shape our character" (1996:1).

This relationship between values and character also exists at the United States Air Force Academy. The Academy's Character Development Program identifies these same three Core Values that the Air Force has recently adopted. As a matter of fact, the current Air Force Core Values originated at the Academy. According to Hall and Wagie, the United States Air Force Academy defines *character* as "the sum of those qualities and moral excellence which stimulates a person to do the right thing which is manifested through right and proper actions despite internal and external pressures to the contrary" (1996:36). The Air Force Academy also teaches the importance of character in its curriculum. In its *Second Class Cadet Study Guide*, the Academy provides an excerpt from Edgar Puryear's book, *Nineteen Stars*. This manuscript was based on interviews with over five hundred officers who had all achieved the rank of at least Brigadier General. The generals were asked, "What role does character play in American military leadership?" The following is a summary of their replies:

> "Without character there is no true leadership;" "Character and leadership are like the popular 'Horse and Carriage.' Both go to make marriage. You can't have one without the other." "Character is the base upon which leadership is built." "Character is the number one attribute of leadership." "I cannot separate leadership from character except that you can have character without leadership, but not leadership without character;" and that "Character is leadership."

More briefly others said that the role of character in leadership is "all important," "vital," "the keystone," "the basis," "the most important factor," "the basic element," "the major role," "the whole work," "decisive," "dominant," "indispensable," "a must," and as General Eisenhower summed it up, "everything." (1993:Block 5, 6)

General Hosmer, retired Superintendent at the Air Force Academy, also provides some strong words to the importance of character. While addressing graduates of the

Academy, he stated that, "Our refocusing efforts began with studying what makes a great leader. The recurring characteristic we found in all great officers is 'Character'" (1994:7).

Little needs to be said to explain the above. What was a bit of a surprise is the lack of emphasis that the current USAF Core Values initiative places on the importance of individual character development and that the stated first task is to fix organizations. This study investigates whether other values-related initiatives, the Air Force Academy, and other external organizations to the Air Force have emphasized the importance of individual character development and the relationship to fixing organizations.

As found in the definition of character, the subject of morals and ethics can easily, and quite often does, come up in the discussions of character and values. Funk and Wagnall's 1956 *New College Standard Dictionary* provides a definition of morals. The following is an excerpt of the first three definitions provided for the word 'moral':

1. Pertaining to character and behavior from the point of view of right and wrong, and obligation of duty; pertaining to rightness and duty in conduct.
2. Conforming to right conduct; actuated by a sense of the good, true, and right; good; righteous; virtuous.
3. Concerned with the principles of right and wrong; ethical; as moral philosophy, moral values.

This definition not only ties morals, character, and values together, it also reflects morals from a point of view of either "right or wrong."

The Air Force Academy's Center for Character Development defines ethics as "principles and/or standards that guide professionals to do what is right, or ought to be done. 'Ethics' or 'ethos' is what ought to be" (1994:7).

Previous Research on the Subjects of Values and Character

This section expands on the subject of what research has been done in the Air Force concerning the subject of values. The discussion provides some additional justification for this research as well as several examples of the research that the Army has conducted in this area.

The subject of values in the Air Force has been discussed since its creation in 1947. In 1972, Dalbey stated the interest in the study of personal values had even then been increasing over the previous twenty years (1972:1). This interest in values continues today. Everywhere we go we are reminded in speeches from any of our leaders that we, the people, are the most valuable resource. Since people are so important, understanding the driving forces (or values) that motivate them to conduct their responsibilities in an acceptable manner must by default be very important. Air Force Manual 1-1 recognizes this truth. Under the subject of Aerospace Power, AFM 1-1 states, "Ultimately, aerospace power depends on the performance of the people who operate, command, and sustain aerospace platforms" (1992:6). AFM 1-1 also states in Chapter Four, "Preparing the Air Force for War," that:

> **People are the decisive factor in war**. Although airmen tend to emphasize the importance of their equipment, how that equipment is used (the human factor) is far more important. (1992:18)

How Air Force personnel choose to operate and the decisions that they make are certainly influenced by their personal values. The individual's personal values are one of the forces that affect ethical decision making (United States Air Force Academy Professional Development Program, Fall Semester, 1993:Block 6-5). Given this, it is imperative to identify how we can effectively inculcate the values that we want Air Force

personnel to have. By understanding previous Air Force values-related initiatives we can be better informed and better able to assess their inconsistencies in the current initiative.

Although the discussion of values has taken place within the Air Force for many years, finding previous relevant studies or research on historical Air Force values-related initiatives was unsuccessful. Several studies were found that compared the values held by different demographical groups in an effort to identify respective differences. Several examples of these studies are provided below to indicate what was found in the initial literature review.

There has been a significant amount of research on the subject of personal values. Dalbey studied the hierarchy of personal values of United States Air Force officers, explained some differences in the personal values systems of the officers, and compared the data concerning the United States Air Force officers to previous research dealing with the personal value systems of United States naval officers and American managers (1972:112).

Research by Brende investigated the existence of dependent relationships between personal value systems and selected Quality of Life indicators among Air Force officers. Brende defined Quality of Life as "an individual's sense of well being" (1975:122).

Dethloff and Doucet in an effort to identify possible reasons why the Air Force pilot retention rate was so low, studied whether the personal and organizational values conflict (1978:2-3).

McCosh compared the value hierarchies of selected Air Force officer groups (company grade officers and field grade officers) to each other and to the civilian population (1986:3). McCosh also investigated whether the value hierarchies of officers

differed based on the source of commission for the company grade officers and field grade officers as well as the length of service for each officer (1986:3).

Marumoto conducted research to examine the differences in values between senior military officers and civilians and between senior military officers of the Army and the Air Force (1988:7).

In each of the above research efforts, surveys were utilized to obtain the data necessary to make the respective comparisons. As supported above, personal values have been measured across a number of different classifications of individuals. Previous research has addressed the differences between officer values within the Air Force, Air Force officer values as compared against officers of the other services, and Air Force officer values compared to the values of the civilian population.

This research is different in that it strives to provide some of the background and historical documentation concerning the issue of values training. It is more concerned with "why" and "how" the Air Force has attempted to develop values among its officers in previous initiatives rather than how have Air Force values compared to those of other populations. No previous research has been found that addresses this area. However, one interesting observation that was made while conducting the initial review of literature was that the Army has completed a number of historical values and ethics related studies in the past. Three of these studies and their findings are provided below.

The first of these studies, authored by Heim, found that the four values of the professional Army ethic (loyalty, duty, selfless service, and integrity) were endorsed and "easily contained in the Judeo-Christian values system" (1993:iii). This assessment was

made by reviewing biblical and related literature concerning the lives of David, Daniel, Joshua, Nehemiah, and Jesus of Nazareth (1993:100).

The second study by Price mentioned that the Army had designed a Task Force, "Character Development-2001," to investigate and develop an ethics program that will meet their needs for the 21st century. In her study, character was defined as "the attribute or feature that makes up and distinguish[es] individuals" (1996:1). Price also states, "Recent publications reiterate with the need for more and better training in universities and service academies to bestow character development on their young charges" (1996:2). According to Price, as the issue of declining budgets and downsizing has threatened the survival of the academies, defenders commonly argue "that the cost-performance debate clouds the issue of the true strength of the service academies: character development" (1996:6). Here Price is stating that all of the service academies are emphasizing the importance of developing character, and if for no other reason, perhaps based on that alone the academies should remain open. Price also found that the ethics and character curriculums were very different between ROTC institutions and the academies, mainly in the areas of platform hours of instruction and officer selection (1996:19).

The third study was conducted by Naworol which reviewed how the early development of character in the life of Robert E. Lee played a large, if not most important, role in his successes. Naworol stated that "Moral character in leaders is recognized as an important ingredient to winning on the battlefield…strong character-centered leadership remains as a key fundamental principle to effective military leadership today" (1995:iii). Naworol concludes that Lee's "character ethic is what gave him the capability to inspire his Army and move the southern nation" (1995:85). Naworol was "convinced that

Aristotle and Clausewitz were correct in saying that genius is composed of intellect and character" (1995:86). Although there were some accounts that indicated Lee was not the most intelligent man, this only adds support for Naworol's argument that character in leaders is equally important to intellectual aspects of being a leader.

The findings from the last several studies provided above were closer to the intent of this research than the previous Air Force research that has been conducted in these areas, but they were also Army specific. This research focuses primarily on Air Force initiatives. Although the focus of this research is highly qualitative, it is nonetheless critical to identifying and understanding what the various initiatives were over time, and the role that character development played or did not play in the initiative. This baseline should prove helpful in subsequent research efforts.

Given the importance and priority placed upon the current Core Values initiative by senior Air Force leadership, research is necessary to ensure that it is credible. This includes being consistent, where appropriate, with previous Air Force values-related initiatives as well as being externally valid with current thinking in organizations outside of the Air Force. In the cases where differences do exist, they should be explainable. By identifying and comparing the previous initiatives to the current initiative, possible improvements may surface that could be incorporated into the current initiative or that if clarified would increase the credibility of the current initiative.

This research identifies previous values-related initiatives and identifies and evaluates the emphasis placed on certain attributes such as character development where an effort is being made to inculcate particular values to its employees.

Problem Statement

There is little existing literature that identifies, discusses or evaluates any of the previous Air Force values-related initiatives. As a result, no comparison or assessment can currently be conducted until the previous initiatives are identified. Once these initiatives are identified, an initial assessment needs to be conducted to identify any significant differences.

Further, the logic of two of the assumptions within the Air Force Core Values initiative also seem to merit further study. Specifically, the two assumptions that are made in the current initiative that are compared to historical initiatives include: (1*) The Core Values Strategy exists independently of and does not compete with Chapel programs*; and (2) *Our first task is to fix organizations; individual character development is possible, but it is not a goal*. The first assumption raises the question of why an initiative such as this, "attempting to transform a climate of corrosion into a climate of ethical commitment," would want to divorce itself from chapel programs. The second question that it raises is why one would expect any Air Force program to compete with any other Air Force program. The second assumption also raises a question. Based upon the *Guru's Guide*, which is supporting documentation for the current Core Values initiative, "Only human beings can recognize and follow values. Organizations have and follow values only in so far as significant numbers of their members have and follow them" *(Air Force Core Values—Guru's Guide*, Chapter VI:2). If this is true, why does the Air Force emphasize fixing the organization first, rather than the individual? Further, it begs the question of whether organizations can or should be fixed before fixing the individual.

Research Objectives

This research has two primary objectives which are identified below:

1. To identify and provide a chronology of the historical Air Force values-related initiatives that preceded the current Air Force Core Values initiative.
2. To compare and contrast the Air Force values related initiatives as well as initiatives being conducted at the United States Air Force Academy. Special attention was given to how each initiative addresses individual character development and the role of the chaplain and other selected attributes.

Research Questions

This study has four research questions that are addressed. These include:

1. What initiative directly preceded the current Air Force Core Values initiative?
2. What other Air Force initiatives/programs/efforts related to values have been conducted? These initiatives could include any previous Air Force effort that is focused on such issues as character, morals, values, and ethics as opposed to dealing with improving intelligence/skills/knowledge/competency.
3. How are these initiatives similar to and different from the current Air Force Core Values initiative?
4. What have these related initiatives emphasized with respect to character development and the role of the chaplain in conducting the respective training?

Intended Scope and Limitations

While values-related initiatives both within the DOD and external sources were referenced, the focus was on the USAF. Further, although the Core Values are clearly stated to apply to all Air Force personnel, much of this research focused primarily on the values-related initiatives that are or were directed primarily towards officers and to cadets preparing to become officers at the United States Air Force Academy. This is due to the fact that much of the data found concerning USAF values-related initiatives had as a primary audience officers and Academy cadets. Several other initiatives that had a much broader scope across Air Force personnel were also reviewed.

There are several limitations of this study. First, this research focuses only on Air Force values-related programs. Reference to other related efforts in education and to the other services is minimal. It is likely that a more thorough literature review of the existing values-related initiatives in each of the other services as well as in agencies external to the DOD (such as education and industry) may produce additional findings that the Air Force could incorporate to improve the overall effectiveness of its initiative. In addition to the Academy, there are a number of additional educational institutions in the Air Force that provide "values" training to both company grade and field grade officers. These include the accession schools, (Officer Training School, and Reserve Officer Training Corps), and professional military education (PME). Examples of PME where these values are taught to different degrees include Squadron Officer School, Air Command and Staff College, and Air War College.

Second, there is not much consideration for training provided to enlisted personnel and civilians through educational institutions. The exception is in instances where a respective initiative, such as the Air Force's current Core Values initiative relates to all Air Force employees.

Third, the issue of whether or not adults can be significantly impacted by a character development program is not a focus of this study and is only minimally addressed. Many would argue that by far the most productive time to inculcate individuals with values is at childhood under the lead efforts of the parents.

Another limitation is that since this research is not experimental, the results do not provide an assessment of the actual success of the current baseline initiative as compared to the success that a "new and improved" version of the Core Values or a previous values

initiative that included the appropriate emphasis, would or did achieve. The current Core Value initiative is still too "young" to conduct a fair assessment of its effectiveness.

Two of the largest limitations or constraints concerning this research were the fact that few individuals had actually been associated with more than one of the respective values-related initiatives. The consequence of this is that the subjectivity is increased concerning the differences between the initiatives. The other limitation is the fact that little historical documentation has been kept by the respective organizations that were responsible for the earlier initiatives.

Last, this research begins with the premise that there is nothing wrong with the three Core Values that the Air Force has chosen. This does not mean that these are the only or perhaps best values to which Air Force personnel should aspire. What it does mean is that the three values are universal enough that it is believed that most individuals will accept them as being worthwhile and honorable values to believe in and pursue. Some may argue that these are not the most appropriate values or that perhaps the three are only a small subset of the values that should be held in such high regard as "the glue that unifies the force and ties us to the great warriors and public servants of the past" as stated in the pamphlet. AF leadership acknowledges this criticism in the pamphlet by stating,

> Some persons are bothered by the fact that different branches of the service recognize different values; other persons are bothered by the fact that the Air Force once recognized six values and has now reduced them to three. But these persons need not worry. It is impossible for three or six or nine Core Values to capture the richness that is at the heart of the profession of arms. The values are road signs inviting us to consider key features of the requirements of professional service, but they cannot hope to point to or pick out everything. By examining integrity, service, and excellence, we also eventually discover the importance of duty, honor, country, dedication, fidelity, competence, and a host of other professional requirements and attributes. The important thing is not the three road signs

> our leaders choose. The important thing is that they have selected road signs, and it is our obligation to understand the ethical demands these road signs pick out. (*The United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet)*

Structure of the Research

Chapter 1 provides an introduction to the newly introduced Air Force Core Values initiative and identifies several assumptions that are made in the current initiative that may be different from the historical direction of past initiatives dealing with values. Chapter 1 also provides the groundwork for the subjects of values and character and identifies previous Air Force and Army research that has been conducted in these areas. It also identifies the problem statement for this research, the specific objectives and questions that this research hoped to achieve and answer and the scope and limitations of the research.

Chapter 2 discusses the methodology that was utilized to complete this research.

Chapter 3 provides perspectives from relevant sources external to the Air Force.

These include The Covey Leadership Center, the Josephson Institute of Ethics, and the Character Education Partnership. Lastly, portions of *Joint Publication 1* (Joint Warfare of the Armed Forces of the United States) that are relevant to the subject of core values and background on West Point's Honor System are also highlighted.

Chapter 4 provides greater background on the current Air Force Core Values initiative. This chapter provides the baseline information upon which previous initiatives were compared. This chapter includes the history of the initiative, a review of its supporting documentation and several additional findings of the initiative.

Chapter 5 identifies the previous Air Force values-related initiatives that have been conducted within the Air Force since just before its creation as a separate service up

through the 1993 initiative where General McPeak instituted the original Air Force Core Values Program.

Chapter 6 identifies related initiatives that are on-going at the United States Air Force Academy.

Chapter 7 contains the analysis and discussion of particular attributes across the values-related initiatives and also against initiatives and policies at the Air Force Academy. It also summarizes these findings and identifies areas where future research can be conducted.

Chapter 2

Methodology

Introduction

This research is both exploratory and historical in nature. The first objective is to identify historical Air Force values-related initiatives and relevant background of each of these initiatives. This study then compares and contrasts the current Air Force Core Values initiative to the previous Air Force Core Values Program under General McPeak, other identified Air Force values related initiatives, initiatives being conducted at the Air Force Academy, and several other organizations external to the Air Force. Because of the exploratory nature of the study, the findings and observations are not explicitly classified as either a strength or a weakness but rather classified as needing further clarification.

Research Design

Due to the historical nature of the research objectives, historical document analysis is the primary technique utilized. Once the historical documentation of the respective values-related initiatives had been gathered, a case study was used to compare the key attributes of the two most recent initiatives, the Academy's initiatives, and the other historical Air Force values-related initiatives.

Yin believes case studies are appropriate when asking exploratory "what" type questions (1994:5). Observation was utilized in order to observe how individuals who were identified as the respective "gurus" within the command actually accepted or rejected the training provided by the discussion leaders.

To accomplish the historical document analysis, the author first needed to obtain the relevant documents to analyze. In order to accomplish these documents, two qualitative techniques, in-depth interviewing and elite interviewing (expert opinion), were used. Yin also encourages the use of several methods, so as to make determinations based on the convergence of multiple sources of evidence (1994:93).

Through discussions with key personnel, from here on referred to as experts, who were familiar and involved with the identified initiatives, it was hoped that these respective experts could not only provide their perspectives and opinions concerning these initiatives, but also point to any existing written documentation that could be obtained, reviewed and perhaps cited so as to ensure the credibility of the study. Personal comments, perspectives, and opinions were also used to support the identified written documentation. This is especially the case where little or no written documentation was found concerning a respective initiative.

No empirical data were found on how effective the previous Air Force initiatives were; therefore without a quantitative baseline upon which to compare the current initiative's success, this research was strictly qualitative.

The following section explains in more detail the methodology for each of the study's two objectives and four research questions.

Research Objective #1

To identify and provide a chronology of the historical Air Force values-related initiatives that preceded the current Air Force Core Values initiative.

Two of the four Research Questions identified in Chapter 1 relate to this objective. They are:

Research Question #1

What initiative directly preceded the current Air Force

Core Values initiative?

Research Question #2

What other Air Force initiatives/programs/efforts related to values have been conducted? These initiatives could include any previous Air Force effort that is focused on such issues as character, morals, values, and ethics as opposed to dealing with improving intelligence/skills/knowledge/competency.

These questions were answered by conducting interviews with expert personnel. Telephone and face to face interviews were conducted with respective experts that had been associated with previous "values/character development" initiatives. This approach was necessary since the author had little experience in this subject as well as the fact that little documentation was found concerning the history of Air Force "values" programs. For the purpose of this study, "experts" are defined as individuals who had direct responsibility for developing, writing, or implementing any of the respective initiatives that are identified. Experts also include historians and individuals who are identified through other expert contacts as knowledgeable sources of information. In other words, the

author started with the individuals responsible for implementation of the current Core Values initiative and worked to identify other individuals who worked previous programs. Consequently, names of experts were obtained both through word of mouth and from written documentation. Related initiatives consist of all initiatives that can be traced as antecedents of any of the later developed programs. Not all programs related to the current Core Values initiative were necessarily called or even had the term "values" in their name. For example, other historical initiatives that included such terminology as "moral leadership" and "character guidance" existed in early Air Force history and were found to be related.

Another approach used in the literature review included word searches in relevant databases, such as the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC). Several studies and other supporting documents were found in DTIC that are referenced in this document.

At the beginning of this journey, the question concerning where the current three Air Force Core Values originated was pondered. Through discussion with several professors at the Air Force Institute of Technology, it was discovered that the Air Force Core Values were first developed at the United States Air Force Academy and later adopted by the Air Force. This was confirmed by contacting the Academy and speaking with experts responsible for implementing the initiative world-wide throughout the Air Force. Further questioning revealed that the implementation responsibility really consisted of a team of individuals comprised primarily by a member of the Philosophy Department at the Air Force Academy and a member from Air Education and Training Command. Through discussions with members of the Academy's Philosophy Department, it was learned that the new Air Force Core Values initiative had its genesis in a previous Core Values

Program under General McPeak where the Air Force espoused six values instead of the current three streamlined values under Secretary Widnall and General Fogleman. A search on the internet for "core values" identified the Air Force Core Values home page.

Once it was learned that the Academy was the originator of the Air Force's current Core Values, a trip was made to the Academy to gather related material concerning the current Air Force initiative as well as to gather information on other related efforts that are on-going at the Academy. This trip provided several of the source documents that are discussed in this research and were the beginning of the "journey." The documents obtained led the author to other offices and individuals across the United States as well as one individual now stationed in Germany to contact relevant individuals who were key players (experts) in the development and implementation of the respective initiatives. A list of these key experts who were interviewed concerning these initiatives is provided in Table 1. These individuals are provided in the order in which they were initially interviewed. Follow-on interviews were also conducted with several of these individuals.

Table 1. Experts Interviewed Concerning Values-Related Initiatives

Name	Responsibility
1. Lt Col Jeffrey Zink	Dept of Philosophy, USAFA
2. Lt Col Pat Tower	Current Core Values initiative Co-administrator, Dept of Philosophy, USAFA
3. Col Charles Myer	Director, Dept of Philosophy, USAFA
4. BGen Karen Rankin	AETC/XP
5. Capt Steve Davis	Honor Education Officer, USAFA
6. Lt Col Ken Barker	Director, Honor Division, USAFA
7. Mr. Duanne Reed	USAFA Archives specialist
8. Maj Carl Rehberg	Previously assigned to Center for Character Development, USAFA, (Honor Division)
9. Chaplain (Maj) Eric Fenton	Air Force Institute of Technology Chaplain
10. Pastor Steven A. Crossman, Reserve Chaplain (Major)	Reserve Chaplain with McPeak Core Values initiative experience
11. Chaplain (Lt Col) Brian Vansickle	Previously assigned to Center for Character Development, USAFA, and primary author of Design for Spiritual Development pamphlet, USAFA
12. Maj Lee DeRemer	Previously worked for General Fogleman, Long Range Planning office
13. Col James Woody	Center for Character Development, USAFA
14. Col Chuck Yoos	Center for Character Development, USAFA
15. Lt Col Michael Fekula	Center for Character Development, USAFA
16. Lt Col Doug Dunford	Current Core Values initiative Co-administrator, AETC
17. Lt Col Ed Billman	Member of the Air Force Quality Council Working Group at AETC in 1993 under General McPeak's Core Values Program
18. Chaplain (Lt Col) Alex Roberts	Primary writer of 1993 McPeak Core Values Personal Application Handbook
19. Chaplain (Major) James Cutter	Chaplain Service Institute
20. Msgt Ingrid Metcalf	Air Force Quality Institute, experience with McPeak's Core Values initiative
21. Chaplain (Lt Col) Ken Colten	Civil Air Patrol

When contact was made with individuals who were identified as expert, the author introduced himself and provided a brief explanation of the effort that he was conducting. The author then proceeded to query the individuals concerning their involvement with the

respective initiative with which they had experience. Open ended questions such as the following were asked: What was your involvement with the respective initiative? What events led to the genesis of that respective initiative? Who was responsible for implementation of the initiative? What type of written documentation do you have concerning the initiative? What was your perspective concerning the initiatives strengths and/or weaknesses? Who else could I speak with that is familiar with this initiative that the author may be able to obtain additional documentation from? Is the individual aware of any other information concerning any of the other value related initiatives or other points of contact that could be able to provide additional insight?

As can be imagined, depending on the respective experience of the individual being interviewed, the interviews lasted from five minutes to over an hour. Multiple discussions were held with several of these experts. Depending on the interviewee's response to each of the above questions, follow-up questions were often pursued. While no formal statistical data collection was accomplished for analysis, the author was able to obtain qualitative insight and expert opinion. The inputs are reflected and identified where appropriate in subsequent chapters.

Because of the sensitivities that sometimes surround initiatives such as these, most interviewees agreed to provide their perspectives but shared some concerns about being quoted verbatim. In order to overcome this, the author agreed to discuss many of the comments in a more generic fashion, where for example a statement may be attributed to "an individual close to the effort" rather than to a specific individual. Only in several sections have experts been quoted, and in these cases permission has been granted from the respective individuals.

Research Objective #2

To compare and contrast the Air Force values related initiatives as well as initiatives being conducted at the United States Air Force Academy. Special attention is given to how each initiative addresses individual character development and the role of the chaplain and other selected attributes.

This objective is related to the research questions three and four which ask,

Research Question #3

How are these initiatives similar to and different from the current Air Force Core Values initiative?

Research Question #4

What have these related initiatives emphasized with respect to character development and the role of the chaplain in conducting the respective training?

The methodology used to answer these research questions is very similar to the previous approaches mentioned above. The answers to these questions were obtained through document analysis and by conducting interviews with those identified as the experts. This objective is interested in identifying changes that have been made over time between these related initiatives. Amongst these changes and differences, this research focuses on the emphasis or lack thereof on individual character development and the role of the chaplain.

In order to answer this question, a case study was conducted. According to Robert Yin, in addition to the study's questions themselves, there are several other components of a research design that are especially important. Two of these components that are

relevant to this effort are the units of analysis and the criteria for interpreting the findings (1994:20).

Units of Analysis

Concerning the units of analysis, Yin states, "As a general guide, the definition of the units of analysis (and therefore of the case) is related to the way the initial research questions have been defined" (1994:22).

The units of analysis in this study are the attributes of the different initiatives. A list of the attributes used in the analysis are provided in Table 2. For purposes of this study, four groupings of initiatives were considered: the current Core Values initiative, the previous Core Values Program, the Air Force Academy initiatives, and all other historical Air Force values-related initiatives. Because of the groupings of the last two categories, some generalization had to take place. For example, it may be that three of the four previous Air Force initiatives were concerned with character development. That grouping would still show that overall, the initiatives were concerned with that aspect. The same rationale exists for the Academy's programs.

Table 2. Attributes Considered in the Case Study

Stated Intent/Purpose of Initiative
Role of the Commander
Role of the Chaplain
Audience
Centralized or Decentralized
Communication Media
Authors of Supporting Materials
Amount of Supporting Material
Types of Supporting Material
Emphasis on Character Development
Emphasis on Fixing Organization
Spiritual Emphasis
Tone of Associated Pamphlet and Supporting Material
Basis/Foundation of Respective Chosen Values
Supporting Role/Advisor to the Commander on Initiative
Number of Values in the Initiative

Criteria for Interpreting the Findings

Concerning the other important component in a case study, criteria for interpreting the findings, the guidance available is even less. Yin states, "Currently, there is no precise way of setting the criteria for interpreting these types of findings. One hopes that the different patterns are sufficiently contrasting that…the findings can be interpreted in terms of comparing at least two rival propositions" (1994:26). Because of this, great care must be taken in developing these criteria so that any bias is minimized and so other readers will agree that the criteria established appear reasonable.

This study does not attempt to classify the identified differences as either a strength or a weakness, but rather it groups all significant differences in the category referred to as "needing further clarification." Even in the case where the current Core Values initiative differs from all previous values-related initiatives, the attribute is still classified as needing

further clarification since it was not within the scope of this research to identify the "goodness" or "badness" of any of the initiatives attributes.

Just because the findings of this research are classified as an area "needing further clarification," it by no means implies that these issues are unimportant. Rather, since this historical research was exploratory in nature and because very few Air Force personnel contacted or interviewed had much involvement or knowledge in any more than one of the identified initiatives, it was first necessary to identify what the key differences were. Future research can further explore each of the issues that are identified.

Protection of Quality Within the Research

All research designs need to ensure that quality is maintained in the areas of construct validity, internal validity, external validity, and reliability. Case study methodologies are no different (Yin, 1994:33). This research incorporates two of the tactics recommended by Yin. The first tactic that was used to ensure construct validity was the collection of data from a number of different sources. Yin refers to this as triangulation (1994:91).

The second tactic that was used to address the issue of reliability was the disclosure of the major experts who were interviewed and whose comments and recommended documentation served as the basis for this research. Another means of ensuring that reliability is maintained is through the use of a case study protocol. The following section discusses this protocol.

Case Study Protocol

Yin refers to the use of a case study protocol as "a major tactic in increasing the reliability of case study research and is intended to guide the investigator in carrying out

the case study" (1994:63). Yin identifies that the protocol should include an overview of the case study project, field procedures (which includes the general sources of information), case study questions, and a guide for the case study report (1994:64-65). The first three of these areas are discussed below.

Overview of the Case Study Project

All of the individuals interviewed were informed of the focus of the study. The participants were also ensured that they would not be directly quoted unless their permission was received. In some cases where direct quotations were used, copies of the draft write-up were faxed to the respective individual to verify accuracy of the quotation and context that it was placed.

Field Procedures (Sources of Information)

The sources of information were numerous. Table 1 provides a list of the primary experts who were contacted and interviewed concerning the previous initiatives. These sources also provided recommendations concerning what additional documentation should be obtained and where it could possibly be found. These recommended sources that were obtained and utilized can be found in the bibliography of this study.

Case Study Questions

As mentioned above, open ended questions were utilized. Depending on the answers to the questions and the overall experience that the interviewee had with previous initiatives, additional questions were asked. The time of each interview also varied based upon the different amount of knowledge each respective expert had.

Summary

This chapter described the techniques that were used to gather data to accomplish the research objectives by answering each of the research questions. The synthesis of this historical data allowed the research objectives to be met by answering each of the research questions.

This chapter explained how through interviews and document analysis, Air Force values-related initiatives were traced back to the creation of the Air Force. Once these initiatives were identified, they were compared to identify similarities, differences and areas needing further clarification. Document analysis was the only method used for gathering data relevant to sources external to the USAF.

The next three chapters present the literature reviews and the data gathered that was necessary to conduct the comparison. The comparative analysis occurs in Chapter VII. The results of this analysis can then be used to make changes where and if appropriate to the current Core Values initiative, and also as ideas for future research in the areas identified as needing further clarification.

Chapter 3

Relevant Sources External to the Air Force

Chapter Overview

This chapter reviews some of the selected references that provide both the setting and framework within which the USAF Core Values initiative should be examined in order to obtain a better understanding of the basis of such initiatives from organizations external to the USAF. Further it establishes the "thinking" on the importance of quality, strategic planning, vision, mission and core values and the importance of character education and development both to improving individuals and organizations. This chapter contains data from sources recommended by either the experts previously identified or referenced in the USAF Core Values initiatives in 1993 or 1997. Three organizations which are separate and distinct from the military that are recognized in this general area are The Covey Leadership Center, the Josephson Institute of Ethics, and the Character Education Partnership. Lastly, relevant portions of *Joint Publication 1* (Joint Warfare of the Armed Forces of the United States) and background on West Point's Honor System are also highlighted.

Background

In searching efforts external to the USAF, probably the most significant movement in US society in the 1980s was the quality movement, led by Dr. Edward Deming. In his 1982 book, *Out of the Crisis*, Dr. Deming writes "This book teaches the transformation that can only be accomplished by man. A company cannot buy its way into quality—it must be led into quality by top management" (1982:inside cover). Dr. Deming listed fourteen points that showed the way out of the crisis. Other inspirational works included *In Search of Excellence*, by Thomas Peters and Robert H. Waterman Jr.. This book outlines eight basic principles used by the best run American companies to stay on top of their respective industry (1982:235). In addition to staying close to the customer, one of the principles was productivity through people—creating in all employees the awareness that their best efforts are essential.

Many other renowned authors such as Dr. Stephen Covey, in his *Seven Habits of Highly Effective People* and *Principle Centered Leadership* in the late eighties and early nineties respectively, strongly suggested a reexamination of the individual and corporate philosophy that should include the use of a vision statement, a mission statement, and core values. These and other references emphasized the importance of the human element and called for a transformation from short term management of things to longer term leadership of people. While all three of the above authors have both national and international recognition, they reflect the national thinking that continues to impact US industry, academia, as well as the military. Most relevant to this subject are the works of Stephen Covey because of his emphasis on the importance of two characteristics that determine the value of individuals as leaders. These are competence and character. Both

are essential in the development of trust between one individual and another. It is Covey's opinion that "Trust or the lack of it is at the root of success or failure in relationships and in the bottomline results of business, industry, education, and government" (1992:31).

Introduction

The next several sections briefly review the relevance of data obtained that reflects the thinking and teaching of the Covey Leadership Center. Several references were contained and Dr. Covey's book *Seven Habits of Highly Effective People*, were referenced in the bibliography of the Pamphlet, *Foundations for Quality: Air Force Core Values*, which was distributed under the 1993 Core Values Program. The other two organizations that are discussed, the Character Education Partnership and the Josephson Institute of Ethics, offer interesting insights on the need for character education, current trends and leading performers.

The Covey Leadership Center (Dr. Stephen Covey)

Several of the principles and concepts referenced in the McPeak Core Values Program had their genesis in the teachings of this organization. The Covey Leadership Center emphasizes two leadership characteristics: skills (or competence) and character. Covey states, "Character is what a person is; skills are what a person can do" (1992:196).

In much of the general literature reviewed as well as the specific citations that are addressed here, it is difficult to find a taxonomy for the numerous topics such as values, ethics, morals, principles, virtue, wisdom, codes, trust, and character. Likewise, some of these words are used somewhat interchangeably within the current USAF Core Values initiative. As a baseline for this effort, this research provides some relationships that add

structure. Covey sees that all actions should be tied to principles which he equates to natural laws. From a core set of principles, the character element then becomes the most important characteristic and provides the beginning of *Principle Centered Leadership*.

In *Principle Centered Leadership,* he introduces a new paradigm—that we center our lives and our leadership of organizations and people on certain "true north" principles. The use of this terminology was found in briefings on Core Values that were given during the 1993 Core Values initiative. In this book, Covey deals with what the principles are, why we need to become principle centered and how we attain this quality. Covey states:

> Principles are not invented by society: they are laws of the universe that pertain to human relationships and human organizations. They are part of the human condition, consciousness and conscience. To the degree people recognize and live in harmony with such basic principles as fairness, equity, justice, integrity, honesty, and trust they move towards either survival and stability on the one hand or disintegration and destruction on the other. (1992:18)

Also according to Covey:

> Principles apply at all times in all places. They surface in the form of values, ideas, norms and teachings. They uplift, enable, fulfill, empower and inspire people.
>
> Principle Centered Leadership is based upon the reality that we cannot violate these natural laws with impunity. Whether or not we believe in them, they have been proven throughout history. Individuals are more effective and organizations are more empowered when they are guided and governed by these proven principles. They are not easy, quick fix solutions to personal and interpersonal problems. Rather, they are foundational principles that when applied consistently become behavioral habits enabling fundamental transformations of individuals, relationships and organizations. (1992:19)

The foundational principle in an individual according to Covey is trustworthiness and between individuals is trust. This value or character trait is best equated to what the current Core Values pamphlet identifies as "Integrity." Further, the *United States Air*

Force Core Values Pamphlet states that integrity is a "character trait." The 1993 Core Values program states "Core Values are not just nice ideas to which we give lip service. They are foundational principles upon which a truly quality Air Force is built" (*Foundations for Quality: Air Force Core Values,* 20). It does appear that core values are fundamental principles and represent a reflection consistent with Covey thinking.

Other individuals have also emphasized the importance of trust. One such quote by Chaplain Roberts, the principal contributor to the 1993 pamphlet, *Foundations for Quality: Air Force Core Values, A Personal Application Handbook*, is "A constant theme of the Air Force today is the notion that enduring quality will only flow out of an 'institutional culture' characterized by trust" (1994, 45). Another is made by Taylor who states that "West Point requires of her students a character for trustworthiness that knows no evasions" (1948:3). These statements provide an indication of the importance and the emphasis that the subject of trust receives in military environments.

If we accept Covey's two essential ingredients of character and competence and his respective views that character is what a person is and competence is what a person can do, this provides clearer understanding of much of the data that follows. Character is "the sum of those qualities and moral excellence which stimulates a person to do the right thing which is manifested through right and proper actions despite internal and external pressures to the contrary" (1996:36).

Competence is the quality of possessing the skill, knowledge and experience to perform a task (*Foundations For Quality: Air Force Core Values*, 3). Competence also includes intelligence as defined in other literature examined.

Character and competence then, can be viewed as the human competencies. Given these definitions of character and competence, other data relating the two clearly indicate the importance of both and their relationships. Several examples of this relationship that were stated in the CEP report are provided in Table 3. For example, Martin Luther King stated "intelligence plus character—that is the goal of true education" (1996, ii). Theodore Roosevelt stated , "To educate a person in mind and not in morals is to educate a menace to society" (13). Another supporting statement concerning this issue, that is not in the CEP report, states, "Character education is as old as education itself. Down through history, education has had two great goals: to help people become smart and to help them become good" (Lickona, 1993:6). While other references are made in this effort on the importance of character, none hit harder and more relevant than the statement from the USAF Academy, Honor Code Reference Handbook of the Air Force Cadet Wing. It states, "**The Academy experience is designed to make character central to tomorrow's Air Force leader**" (1996:21). With this emphasis on the importance of character development in the individual, the next section reflects Covey's views relating the individual to the organization.

Individual Versus Organizational Change. Which one should be corrected first, the individual or the organization? Does it really matter? Dr. Covey and Dr. Deming think so. Covey states:

> W. Edward Deming, the economic Isaiah of our time, has said that about 90 percent of the problems in organizations are general problems (bad systems)—only about 10 percent are specific problems with people. Many managers misinterpret such data, supposing that if they correct the structure and systems (programs), the problems with people (programmers) will go away. The reverse is actually true: if you correct the 10 percent first, the other problems go away. Why? Because people

> are the programmers, and they use systems and structure as the outward expressions of their own character and competence. If you want to improve the program, work first on the programmer; people produce the strategy, structure, systems, and styles of the organization. These are the arms and hands of the minds and hearts of people .
>
> The key to creating a total quality organization is first to create a total quality person who uses true north "compass" that is objective and external, that reflects natural laws or principles, as opposed to values that are subjective and internal. (1992:252)

This is very different from the strategy that the Air Force Core Values initiative has chosen as is discussed in the next chapter. Covey agrees that organizations can and should be improved and fixed, he just disagrees that the organization can be "tackled" first. But that is not all that Covey has to say on this subject. Covey states:

> Total quality is a total philosophy, a total paradigm of continuous improvement in all four dimensions. And it is sequential; if you don't have it personally, you won't get it organizationally. You can't expect organizations to improve when the people don't improve. You might improve systems, but how do you get a commitment inside the culture to improve systems? People have to grow and mature to where they can communicate to solve the problems to improve those systems. (1992:259)

Covey again makes it clear that he believes fixing the individual must come before you can expect the organization to be improved. The four dimensions that Covey recognizes are security, guidance, wisdom and power. Concerning personal change and personal quality, he states, "Not only must personal change precede organizational change, but personal quality must precede organizational quality (1992:265). Covey shares a supporting idea from a bit of a different perspective. He states, "A cardinal principle of Total quality escapes many managers: You cannot continuously improve interdependent systems and processes until you progressively perfect interdependent, interpersonal relationships (1992:267).

Under the section entitled, "Personal Precedes Organizational Change," Covey again explicitly addresses this issue. He states:

> It's almost axiomatic to say that personal change must precede or at least accompany management and organizational change; otherwise the duplicity and double-mindedness will breed cynicism and instability. Life's imperative is to grow and die, stretch or stagnate. (1992:284)

Covey provides an illustration of how it would make little sense to try to improve your tennis game before you took the time to develop your muscles that assist in making the better strokes. He continues by stating, "Some things necessarily precede others. We cannot run before we can walk or walk before we can crawl. Neither can we change our management styles without first changing personal habits" (1992:285). With the emphasis on character and the need for character education and development, the following data on the CEP again provides additional background, status and acknowledges the USAF Academy as a leader in character development.

Character Education Partnership

The Character Education Partnership (CEP) believes it has seen tremendous growth in character education just in the past several years since its foundation in 1993. The Character Education Partnership (CEP), which was founded in 1993:

> works with education associations, school officials, parent organizations, and community leaders across the United States to provide the most effective character education possible for the improvement of schools, students, the education process, and ultimately for the betterment of civic society. (1996:ii)

The 1996 CEP report provides several excerpts showing broad support for character education. The following statements show the diverse amount of support for character education from the public and government:

> Recent public opinion polls by respected polling organizations as well as the large number of national organizations that have joined character education coalitions indicate that character education has strong and growing public support among the American people across a wide spectrum of political, intellectual, political viewpoints, by people of liberal and conservative spiritual beliefs, and by individuals who are not affiliated with any religious group. (1996:21)

Concerning government support for character education:

> The breadth and strength support for character education is reflected in increasing activities among state and federal government officials in support of character education. At a time when there is very little that the two major parties can agree upon, character education has strong bipartisan support. (1996:23)

Concerning Congress,

> In 1994 both the House and Senate unanimously adopted a joint resolution supporting character education.…Congress also enacted the Improving America's school Act of 1994 which, among other things, reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. (1996:23)

On February 2, 1994, President Clinton wrote to the CEP on the occasion of its first annual forum. The President stated:

> [You] can be proud of your efforts to promote such essential virtues as responsibilities, fairness, and service among young people who otherwise might not receive such guidance. By working to develop character education programs across the country, you are helping to instill important values in our children, brighten their futures and the future of the world. (1996:25)

In their report, the CEP provides several examples of successful character education within elementary schools, middle schools, high schools and also within higher education. The most relevant for this study is in the case of higher education. The CEP recognizes the Air Force Academy as a leader in the area of character development. In their report on the development of character education in the U.S. schools from 1993 through 1996, they state:

> …only a few institutions of higher education address the underlying causes of negative behavior with comprehensive efforts to encourage and develop good character in their students. An example of an institution that has made character development a central part of its mission is the U.S. Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs, Colorado. (1996:17-18)

The CEP also provides a brief history of character education in America. This is provided below to portray at least one perspective on how character education has changed over American history. The following segment not only describes a brief history of character education, it also provides the background and respective events that led to the creation of the CEP itself. This background is relevant in that the Air force experienced much of the same trend that is identified below. Similarities in the respective values-related initiative can be seen when compared against this history of character education in America during the same relative time periods. The report states:

> In America, developing good character in young people was an essential part of the educational mission from the colonial period through the first part of the 20th Century. Colonial schools were originally established to teach children to read so they could read the Bible and better learn and understand religious principles and values. Through much of the U.S. history character development of young people has been closely tied to the moral teachings of dominant religious groups in local communities. Such lessons were transmitted by schools as well as by families, communities, and religious institutions. This tradition was continued during the 19th Century when McGuffey's Readers became the most widely used school books throughout the United States. The Reader's were full of Biblical stories and other moral lessons.
>
> During most of the period since the mid-1950s, the identification of moral education goals and objectives was greatly reduced in curriculum guides and materials produced by state departments of education and many local schools. This change of focus was tied to a recognition that education in the moral domain is highly complex. Also at work was the ascendancy of the philosophy of logical positivism which led to the questioning of the school's role in imparting moral principles. Many educators doubted that moral education could produce results that could be measured objectively, as with mathematics and science, and therefore questioned whether it was appropriate in the curriculum.

> Furthermore, as the U.S. population became more diverse through immigration, some parents began to object to religious teaching and practices in the public schools that were incompatible with their own beliefs. The Supreme court began to uphold such complaints on the basis of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. which provides in part "Congress shall make no laws respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof…" Uncertain of what they could and could not legally do, school officials began to shy away from moral education altogether as a way of avoiding controversy and potential litigation. It also became apparent to many teachers and young people that prominent national leaders in business, government, entertainment, and other fields were operating under moral systems very different from traditional American values. With the focus on moral education somewhat blurred, many schools turned to 'values clarification' which advocated helping students to explore their own moral views, listen to the views of their classmates, and decide for themselves their own moral precepts and systems. This approach, which lacked a moral anchor, has been largely discredited although it still exists in some schools. (*Character Education Partnership*, 1996:3-4)

These statements suggest that character education was important in early American civilization and over time gradually disappeared and was replaced with 'values clarification,' which is discussed in Chapter V. Today, the pendulum has swung back towards character education.

The CEP also provides a number of relevant quotations concerning their perspective on the subject of character development. Several of these quotations are provided below in Table 3:

Table 3. Quotations from CEP Report

"Intelligence plus character—that is the goal of true education" Martin Luther King
"To educate a person in mind and not in morals is to educate a menace to society" Theodore Roosevelt
"Moral education does mean that students should be concerned not just about what will work, but about what is right. It means teaching them to ask: 'Is it good?'" Ernest L. Boyer Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
"In teaching ethics, one thing should be made central and prominent: right and wrong do exist." Christina Hoff Sommers

Source*: Character Education Partnership,* 1996:8, 13, 18, 28

Two overriding principles are stressed in the above four quotations. Dr. King and President Roosevelt stress the importance of developing both intelligence and character within individuals. Boyer and Sommers emphasize doing what is 'right'. These are different from the principles stressed in the current Air Force Core Values initiative which is discussed in Chapter VII, "Analysis."

The CEP shares many success stories across the different levels of education. The CEP also provides examples of how different organizations within the three branches of our government, specifically Congress, the President, and the Supreme Court, are all showing strong support through the decisions and policies that are being made. In addition to these, the U.S. Department of Education and many state governments have spoken out in support of character education (1996:23-26). According to the CEP, the Department of Education sent guidelines out to all of the Superintendents in the United States in August 1995 "in order to clarify what is permitted and what is prohibited by the Constitution with respect to religious activities in public schools" (1996:26). Among the guidelines is this statement in support of character education:

> Teaching values: Though schools must be neutral with respect to religion, they may play an active role with respect to teaching civic values and virtue, and the moral code that holds us together as a community. The fact that some of these values are also held by religions does not make it unlawful to teach them in school. (1996:26)

With this background on character education and development, and some of the recent emphasis, the next section outlines the surveys of the Josephson Institute of Ethics reflecting the problem and a statement about what society needs to do.

Josephson Institute of Ethics

The Josephson Institute is primarily known for the comprehensive study that it conducted on the subject of ethics, values, attitudes, and behavior in 1991 and 1992. This organization began in 1987 and according to a point paper developed on 5 April 1994, it is one of the ten groups with whom the Air Force Academy's Center for Character Development has established a network.

This report by the Josephson Institute has been referred to by some as "perhaps the most comprehensive survey of American ethical attitudes and behaviors ever undertaken" (1992: Appendix A-3). The survey included 8,965 young people and adults in 1991 and 1992 and had over 100 objective and open-ended questions focusing exclusively on ethical issues (1992: Appendix A-3).

The study concluded that "There is a hole in the moral ozone and it is probably getting bigger" (Appendix, A-3). The report found significant evidence that suggested the present 15-30 year old generation was more likely to engage in dishonest and irresponsible conduct than previous generations. The report clarified, that although there were no "truly comparable benchmarks" to establish the fact that things are measurably worse, the data did show they are clearly bad (Appendix, A-3).

The study found that too many young people today steal, lie, and cheat on their job, in school, and in their personal relationships. The premise of the study was that these young people are the stewards of tomorrow, and that their dishonesty and irresponsibility may lead to political, economic and environmental crises of unprecedented enormity (Appendix, A-3). Appendix C of the Josephson report provides 136 tables of findings. These findings provide reasons for concern, as many of the measures showed high rates of undesired activity. Example of these activities included shoplifting, resume fraud, falsification of reports, lying to the boss or customer and cheating on exams.

Although these findings are only for students, who some will argue just need time to mature, these results give us reason to be concerned. All of the examples referenced above can lead to problems in the workforce. Some of these issues identified above are the same issues that the Air Force is wrestling with, and what the Core Value of Integrity first tries to overcome.

In the section titled, "What Society Needs To Do," the report states:

> The character and conduct of our youth reflect the character and conduct of society; therefore, every adult has the responsibility to teach and model the core ethical values and every social institution has the responsibility to promote the development of good character. Since people do not automatically develop good character, conscientious efforts must be made to help young people develop the values and abilities necessary for moral decision making and conduct. Although the responsibility for developing the character of the young is, first and foremost, an obligation of families; it is also an important obligation of faith communities; schools, youth and other human service organizations. Direct instruction on ethics and consistent emphasis and reinforcement of the core ethical values is important but it is not nearly enough. Individuals and institutions, especially the high schools and colleges, must more consistently model ethical behavior and enforce critical principles by demonstrating commitment and attempting to assure that cheaters do not prosper and that those who follow the rules and do the right thing are not disadvantaged. (1992: Appendix A-4)

This recommendation is very strong and broad in nature. It emphasizes that good character is not automatically developed and that is why, according to the report, that it is important that "every adult," "every social institution," every family, and many other groups all accept their role and responsibilities concerning this effort. Understanding that the current Air Force initiative fits in this broader perspective, should improve the acceptability of it.

An additional Air Force perspective that supports the findings of the Josephson Institute of Ethics are provided by General White, USAFR. These statements are his opinion as to how we might build integrity and ethics from within. He suggests:

> We must recognize that the young people we are bringing into our Air Force today, in the main, have not been taught ethically and morally. They reflect the national norm on cheating and lying. Simply giving them a new set of rules with warnings of punishment will not change them.
>
> As these young people go through basic training and Officer Training School, we must not assume that they have a consistent foundation of integrity, morality, and ethics. We need to define and teach moral behavior—both public and private. We must do this repeatedly and consistently, giving it major emphasis. (1996:96)

General White offers a different perspective than that offered by General Fogleman concerning the society at large from which the Air Force is accessing it's personnel. He also does not assume that Air Force personnel, specifically young military personnel, have a good foundation of integrity, morality, and ethics. He believes we need to consistently and repeatedly teach moral behavior.

The next two sections provide additional discussion on related military policies by discussing both the guidance that has been published concerning "Values in Joint Warfare" within *Joint Publication 1* and documentation from West Point concerning the purpose of its Honor System.

Joint Publication 1 (Joint Warfare of the Armed Forces of the United States)

Joint Publication 1 was issued in January 1995. Chapter II is entitled, "Values in Joint Warfare." An excerpt of chapter two of this document (Values in Joint Warfare) is provided below:

> Our military service is based on values—those standards that American military experience has proven to be the bedrock of combat success. These values are common to all the Services and represent the essence of our professionalism. This chapter discusses those values that have a special impact on joint matters.
>
> First and always is integrity. In the case of joint action, as with the Service, integrity is the cornerstone for building trust. We know as members of the Armed Forces that whenever the issue is at hand, we can count on each other to say what we mean and do what we say. This allows us to rely with confidence on others to carry out assigned tasks. This is an enormous advantage for building effective teams. (*Joint Publications 1*:II-1)

The Air Force Core Values initiative is consistent with the guidance contained in this Joint Publication. Chapter II also identifies several other values that are seen as important in joint matters. Including the value of integrity as cited above, the publication identifies a total of five values. These additional values include competence, physical courage, moral courage and teamwork. There are several sub-element values provided under teamwork. These include trust and confidence, delegation, and cooperation. A brief discussion concerning the fourth value in joint warfare, moral courage, addresses the issue of whether we aspire to certain values because they are the right, or do we aspire to certain values just because of their military necessity. The joint publication states:

> Moral courage is essential to military operations. This includes the willingness to stand up for what we believe is right even if that stand is unpopular or contrary to conventional wisdom. Other aspects of courage involve risk taking and tenacity: making bold decisions in the face of uncertainty, accepting full responsibility for the outcome, and holding to the chosen course despite challenges or difficulties…

> We also must have the courage to wield military power in an unimpeachable moral fashion. We respect human rights. We observe the Geneva Conventions not only as a matter of legality but from conscience. This behavior is integral to our status as American fighting men and women. Acting with conscience reinforces the links among the Services and between the Armed Forces of the United States and the American people, and these linkages are basic sources of our strength. (Joint Publications 1:II-2)

This value emphasizes taking certain actions because they are right, not necessarily because they are effective or perhaps the most functional way of doing things. A quote attributed to British Field Marshall Bernard L. Montgomery, a hero of World War II, says of moral courage,

> I had learnt before I left school that of the many attributes necessary for success two are vital—hard work and absolute integrity. To these two I would add a third—courage. I mean moral courage—not being afraid to say or do what you believe to be right. (United States Air Force Academy Professional Development Program Study Guide, Fall Semester, 1993:Block 3-3,4)

Through these statements we see the importance of not always doing what might be the most effective, or functional action. Rather, a whole different dimension of standing up for and doing what you hold as a personal conviction as being either right or wrong, is introduced. This difference is important to note, as the analysis addresses this issue. Another source that provides insight into the military importance of developing character is the United States Military Academy at West Point from which the Air Force adopted many of its traditions and policies. Specifically, the issue concerning the need for an Honor System is addressed.

United States Military Academy at West Point

Documentation was obtained from the United States Military Academy at West Point to see how it explained and justified their need for an Honor System. As was little

surprise, West Point has some strong words concerning the purpose of the Honor System. According to Major General Maxwell D. Taylor, in the pamphlet, *West Point Honor System—Its Objectives and Procedures*, the Honor System exists for several reasons. Taylor states:

> The Honor System at West Point is the outgrowth of many years of development and experience. The need for such a system is implicit in the mission of the Military Academy to develop military leaders. These leaders must have strength of character as well as intellectual and physical vigor. Secretary of War Newton D. Baker eloquently phrased the obligation of the Military Academy to develop character in the following words:
>
> "The purpose of West Point, therefore, is not to act as a glorified drill sergeant but to lay the foundation upon which a career in growth of military knowledge can be based and to accompany it by two indispensable additions; first, such a general education as educated men find necessary for intelligent intercourse with one another; and second, the inculcation of a set of virtues, admirable always, but indispensable in a soldier. Men may be inexact or even untruthful in ordinary matters and suffer as a consequence only the disesteem of their associates or the inconvenience of unfavorable litigation, but the inexact or untruthful soldier trifles with the lives of his fellow men and with the honor of his government, and it is therefore no matter of pride but rather a stern disciplinary necessity that makes West Point require of her students a character for trustworthiness that knows no evasions." Thus, the Honor System has its roots in ethical considerations and in practical military necessity. (1948:2-3)

As can be seen from this citation, the importance of character development is also emphasized at West Point. West Point also strives to inculcate its cadets with "a set of virtues" that are viewed as "indispensable" for its soldiers. This statement also provides the basis, or "roots," of the Honor System. It states that it was based not only on practical military necessity, but also on ethical considerations. This may add some credence to the argument that not only should a policy or set of values be functional, or work in a military environment, but they should also be ethically the correct thing to do as introduced above in the discussion concerning *Joint Publication 1*.

Summary

This chapter has briefly addressed the broader US society issues such as quality, striving for excellence and changing paradigms suggested to center our leadership of organizations and people on "true north" principles. Relationships are established between character issues and competency issues, both of which are required in leadership. Values, specifically core values, are clearly viewed as character issues.

A brief synopsis was provided on the CEP that reflects early results of Character Development efforts and a broader historical context of character development. The CEP also recognizes the outstanding efforts of the Air Force Academy in the area of character development. Previous efforts of the Josephson Institute of Ethics were provided including their prescription of what society needs to do. The portion relevant to core values of the Joint Publication 1 (Joint Warfare of the Armed Forces of the United States) and supporting documentation from West Point were also addressed.

Chapter 4

Current Air Force Core Values Initiative

Chapter Overview

This chapter provides additional background concerning the genesis of the current Air Force Core Values initiative; identifies the existing documentation available to interested users on the initiative; examines the emphasis placed on character development and the role of the chaplain in "values" training; and, provides relevant observations concerning the initiative.

This chapter contains additional information concerning the details of the contents of the *Guru's Guide*, much of which is not directly relevant to the identified problem statement identified in Chapter I, but was captured for historical reference.

Introduction

The Air Force has recently began implementation of a revised Core Values initiative based upon direction from the Secretary Widnall and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General Ronald Fogleman. Senior Air Force leaders have provided strong support and guidance concerning how such an initiative should be implemented. This chapter examines some of the documentation concerning this initiative. Several attributes from

this documentation are later used to compare with the same aspects in previous values-related initiatives.

History of the Current Initiative

Discussion concerning the most recent Core Values initiative began in January 1995 when the Honorable Sheila E. Widnall, Secretary of the Air Force, delivered a speech to the opening session of the Joint Services Conference on Professional Ethics (JSCOPE) where she stated that she was contemplating streamlining the Air Force Core Values from the six identified by General McPeak to the three adopted by the Academy in 1994 *(Air Force Core Values—Guru's Guide*, 1997). *"The Little Blue Book"* that espouses our current three Core Values was officially published on 1 January 1997.

Several other key milestones of this initiative are provided below. These were obtained from Chapter I of *The Guru's Guide*, "The Core Values Initiative: An Introduction." *The Guru's Guide* itself was developed to provide the respective trainers from each command with the necessary background needed to sufficiently understand both the recent history this initiative as well as additional information on the strategy of how it will be implemented. A more detailed description of the information included in the *Guru's Guide* is provided under the "documentation" section of this chapter. These "gurus" are the individuals who were chosen by their respective commanders, based on unique skills, to assist them in developing and implementing a local Core Values plan. Chapter I of *The Guru's Guide* provides the following historic milestones of the current initiative:

> 1995 (May): Secretary Widnall and General Fogleman published a policy letter identifying the Air Force Core Values as Integrity first, Service

before self, and Excellence in all we do. For the next year they give several speeches in which they identify the Core Values and emphasize their crucial importance to the Air Force and the American People.

1996 (Apr): General Fogleman directs AETC/CC, General Boles, and USAFA/CC, Lt Gen Stein, to form the Core Values Strategy Panel (CVSP). AETC/ED, members of the Air Staff, and several other competent authorities are invited to participate on the panel and its associated working group.

1996 (Jun): CORONA Top receives an initial description of the proposed Core Values implementation plan.

1996 (Oct): CORONA Fall receives and approves the final conception of the Core Values implementation plan, including its three phases, website, supporting publication, and oversight committee.

1996 (Nov): CSAF kicks off the field portion of the initiative at General Officers calls held in the continental United States and overseas.

1996 (Nov): The Secretary and Chief of Staff unveil Global Engagement: A Vision for the 21st Century, which expresses where the Air Force is heading in the coming decades and how it will get there. The Core Values are discussed at length in two different places in this document, and they are discussed in such a way as to leave no doubt about their continuing, critical importance to the mission as it is defined by the challenges of the next century. Far from being empty slogans, the Core Values are deemed essential to mission accomplishment.

1996 (Dec): Training of Cadre begins. *(Air Force Core Values—Guru's Guide*, The Core Values Initiative: An Introduction, 1997:1-2)

But why does the Air Force even need an initiative such as this? Some claim that we are already in a spiral downturn in terms of our ethical climate. Others believe that the ethical climate of the Air Force has only continued to improve since 1947. An example of these differing perspectives can be found in recent *Air Force Times* articles on the subject of Core Values.

William Matthews, a staff writer at the *Air Force Times*, did a cover story on the subject of Core Values (February 24, 1997) to which General Fogleman felt compelled to

respond in an editorial to "set the record straight for the members of the Air Force" (March 17, 1997:37). According to Matthews:

> Fogleman is not certain he sees people who shine as brightly as the rest of his dream. And he seems to be on a mission to change that.
>
> He sees a "climate of corrosion" and a "culture of compromise" that threatens to tarnish the force of the future.
>
> His senior leaders also see changing demographics that will require the Air Force to draw members from a more sociologically and economically diverse pool. That, some say, means many will enter the service without having had instilled in them the bedrock values Fogleman thinks should guide all officers and enlisted members.
>
> He seems to believe that the warning signs of "ethical corrosion" are evident today. (February 24, 1997:12)

Matthews also states:

> By 2025, the nation's demographics will be radically different and so, worry Air Force leaders, will its values.
>
> "If you grow up in a single-parent family and are raised on the streets, you have values—street values," a retired Air Force officer explained. "If you are raised in a two-parent family that goes to church every Sunday, you have very different values."
>
> So far, shifting demographics have not been a problem. "The Air Force still gets high-quality" enlisted troops and officers. "They're in a buyers situation," the officer said. They can still afford to demand top quality. But for how long?
>
> Already, many Air Force leaders , including the chief, think the values of American society as a whole have already sunk below standards acceptable to the Air Force.

Matthews concludes this particular section of the article with the following statement, "So the Air Force must now instill the values that families, schools, and churches seem no longer able to do." (February 24, 1997:13)

In response to Matthews cover story, General Fogleman had some strong words of clarification in an editorial, also placed in the *Air Force Times*, three weeks after the original cover story was released. The following excerpt is just a portion of the long response that the Chief felt was required. General Fogleman states:

> After reading the feature on core values in the Feb. 24 issue, I want to set the record straight for the members of the Air Force.
>
> In particular, the cover story painted an inaccurate picture of our service's recent initiatives regarding core values. It also misrepresented my views concerning our service, our people and the society from which they come.
>
> First, the article is incorrect in stating that "General Fogleman sees a climate of corrosion" and a "culture of compromise" evident in our Air Force today.
>
> That is simply not the truth. I am not "worried about the integrity of Air Force personnel and the very soul of the Air Force" as claimed by *Air Force Times*.
>
> In fact, I repeatedly have praised our troops in public and private for being the brightest, and best educated, and most motivated people whom we have ever had in the Air Force. They are all volunteers who want to be with us, and they are doing a truly magnificent job for our service and for the nation.
>
> The vast majority of our people are outstanding military professionals who understand and live by the high standards we expect of them.
>
> As I have said before, our people are the foundation of our strength—they are the reason the U.S. Air Force is the most respected air and space force in the world.
>
> Second, the *Air Force Times* article is wrong in stating that "many Air Force leaders, including the chief, think the values of American society as a whole have already sunk below standards acceptable to the Air Force."
>
> On the contrary, we continue to rely on society to equip America's sons and daughters with fundamental values regarding right and wrong. We recruit and commission more than 35,000 young men and women each year.
>
> Once they are with us, we must inculcate in our people the unique values of our service and the military profession. That is essential if we are to

> safeguard the nation and be able to fight and win America's wars when called upon to do so.
>
> Those in the nation's military are held to a higher standard than those in society at large, because we deal literally in the life and death of our nation's sons and daughters.
>
> Our people must be willing to be in harm's way and make the ultimate sacrifice in the defense of our nation. So, our emphasis on core values stems from the special requirements of our profession.
>
> Third, I have not launched a "core values crusade" to "vector the Air Force back to the path of professional conduct" as stated in the *Air Force Times* article.
>
> We are continuing along a path that the Air Force started down in 1992, when our service leaders identified six core values for the service as part of our quality initiative. (March 17, 1997:37)

General Fogleman also summarizes the initiative by stating, "The bottom line is that our ongoing efforts in the areas of core values are motivated by the desire to inculcate service values in our people via an organized and systematic process throughout their careers (March 17, 1997:37).

Documentation

As a result of the importance that senior leadership has placed on this initiative, a great number of supporting documents and detail were provided in the initial push of the effort. In addition to *The Little Blue Book*, that is the basic guide to the Core Values, the U.S. Air Force has also established a Core Values website. The following section provides a summary of the contents of *The Little Blue Book* and the material located at the Core Values website.

The Little Blue Book

The Little Blue Book, officially referred to as *The United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet*, is comprised of four different sections: Definitions, Why These Core Values?, The Core Value Strategy, and Resources. This section provides a summary of what is available in each section.

The Definitions section does just what it implies, it defines each of the three Core Values. These definitions of these values are summarized in the following three paragraphs.

The United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet defines the core value of **integrity first** as follows:

> Integrity is a character trait. It is the willingness to do what is right even when no one is looking. It is the "moral compass"—the inner voice; the voice of self-control; the basis for the trust imperative in today's military.
>
> Integrity is the ability to hold together and properly regulate all of the elements of a personality. A person of integrity, for example, is capable of acting on conviction. A person of integrity can control impulses and appetites. (*The United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet)*

The core value of **integrity first** also covers such characteristics (moral traits) as courage, honesty, responsibility, accountability, justice, openness, self-respect, and humility.

The pamphlet defines the core value of **service before self** as that quality that

> "tells us that professional duties take precedence over personal desires" (*The United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet).* As a minimum, service before self also includes the following behaviors: rule following, respect for others, discipline and self-control, and faith in the system. Under the category of discipline and self-control, employees are expected to exercise control in the following three areas: anger, appetites, and religious toleration.

The pamphlet defines the core value of **excellence in all we do** as that quality that,

> "directs us to develop a sustained passion for continuous improvement and innovation that will propel the Air Force into a long-term, upward spiral of accomplishment and performance" *(The United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet)*.

The pamphlet also identifies a number of areas where excellence can be achieved: product/service excellence, personal excellence, community excellence (which includes mutual respect and benefit of the doubt), resources excellence (which includes material resource excellence and human resources excellence), and operations excellence (which includes excellence of internal operations and excellence of external operations.

The second section of *The Little Blue Book*, "Why These Core Values?" identifies four reasons why the Air Force has recognized the Core Values and developed a strategy to implement them. These are identified in Table 4.

Table 4. Four Reasons Why the Air Force Has Core Values

The Core Values tell us the price of admission to the Air Force itself
They point to what is universal and unchanging in the profession of arms
They help us get a fix on the ethical climate of the organization
They also serve as beacons vectoring us back to the path of professional conduct; the Core Values allow us to transform a climate of corrosion into a climate of ethical commitment.

The third section of the pamphlet, "The Core Value Strategy," has two major portions. The first includes eight assumptions, of which two (the first and the eighth) have already been identified and briefly discussed. The abbreviated version of the assumptions concerning this initiative are identified in Table 5.

Table 5. Assumptions of the Core Values Initiative

1. The Core Values Strategy exists independently of and does not compete with Chapel programs.
2. You don't need to be a commander in order to be a leader.
3. The leader of an organization is key to its moral climate.
4. Leaders cannot just be good; they also must be sensitive to their status as role models for their people and thus avoid the appearance of improper behavior.
5. Leadership from below is at least as important as leadership from above in implementing the Core Values.
6. A culture of conscience is impossible unless civilians, officers, and enlisted personnel understand, accept, internalize, and are free to follow the Core Values.
7. To understand, accept, and internalize the Core Values, our people must be allowed and encouraged to engage in an extended dialogue about them and to explore the role of the values at all levels of the Air Force.
8. Our first task is to fix organizations; individual character development is possible, but it is not a goal.

Assumptions number one and eight were identified in full in Chapter I, as they are key to this research. They are discussed more in depth later in this chapter.

The second portion of section three is referred to as "The Core Values Continuum." It describes how "the Core Values need to be a major topic of education and training—from accession schools…to senior professional military schools…" "The Core Values must be woven into education and training, and we must be sure that all of our units operationalize the Core Values" *(The United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet)*. This section provides background on how "The Schoolhouse Weave" will be practiced. The section describes three coordinated and simultaneous approaches that should be used to make the values an integral part of the way Air Force personnel conducts their daily life; the Top-Down Approach; the Bottom-Up Approach; and the Back and Forth Approach.

The fourth and last section of the pamphlet, "Resources," identifies the Core Values Website which contains additional resources on the subject. A summary of its contents are identified below.

United States Air Force Core Values Home Page (Website)

This address of the website is *http//www.usafa.af.mil/core-value*/. This site contains a copy of *The Little Blue Book* which can be downloaded as well as a number of additional speeches, quotes, and essays from the Chief of Staff, the Secretary of the Air Force, and other respected authors on the subject of Core Values. The website also includes a bibliography which was compiled by the Air University Library Bibliographers, Maxwell AFB, Alabama in May 1996. This bibliography includes twenty pages of related books, periodicals, other documents, and in several cases the applicable directives across a broad spectrum of subjects related to the Core Values initiative. These subjects include integrity, ethics, values, service before self, mentoring, courage, patriotism, leadership, excellence, accountability, competency, and standards. The website also allows users to provide comments and review answers to questions that have been posed by other individuals interested in the subject of Core Values.

As previously referenced, the Air Force Core Values website contains a link to "gurus" information. Because of the nature of the information, it is password protected for only authorized Air Force personnel. This website allows the user to download *The Guru's Guide*, which consists of seven chapters and three attachments. A brief explanation of each chapter and appendix is provided below to provide the baseline for further comparison.

Chapter I—The Core Values Initiative: An Introduction

This chapter is broken into three major sections: history of the initiative, snapshot of the initiative, and responsibilities. The first section, the history of the initiative, includes the mini-milestones provided above as well as several lessons that can be learned from that history. The four lessons provided include the Air Force Core Values dialogue has been going on for a very long time; the Core Values have been and remain a special interest item for the most senior leaders of the organizations; the senior leadership of the Air Force and the Department of Defense have come to a consensus as to the nature of the Core Values and their essential importance in defining professionalism; and even though the Core Values dialogue stretches back over more than a half of the Air Force's independent history, we are entering a new, more dynamic phase in the relationship between the Core Values and the members of the force *(Air Force Core Values—Guru's Guide*, Chapter I:4).

The second section, "Snapshot of the Initiative," provides a description of the purpose, strategy, method, rules of engagement, and architecture of the initiative. This architecture includes a brief explanation of the field weave, the schoolhouse weave, and the continuation phase which is elaborated in the description of chapters II, III, and IV.

The third section, "Responsibilities," lays out the responsibilities of the commanders, the "gurus" (who primarily serve as advisors and resource managers), and all assigned personnel.

Chapter II—The Field Weave

This chapter has two major sections: Core Values Implementation Planning and The Tactical (Business) Plan. Before these sections are described it is important to first

identify what is meant by the term "Field Weave." The purpose of the "Field Weave" is to ensure that the Core Values are incorporated ("woven") into the entire operational Air Force. This includes all Air Force personnel who are not presently enrolled in formal training or education program, which accounts for the vast majority of Air Force personnel.

The section on Core Values Implementation Planning emphasizes the roles and responsibilities of all wing and group commanders. The section also identifies reference documents that govern the Field Weave, the five goals of the Field Weave, initial implementation guidance, as well as direction to plan for continuing training once the initial implementation has been completed.

The tactical plan includes the same type of guidance as above for local commanders. These include responsibilities, references, and five pages of intermediate goals that should be sought after.

Chapter III—The Schoolhouse Weave

The Schoolhouse Weave is also concerned with accomplishing the necessary training of Air Force personnel, only this section is directed at individuals in formal training and education. "The specific purpose of the Schoolhouse Weave is to introduce Core Values into Air Force education and training in such a way so as to best promote a values-based Air Force" *(Air Force Core Values—Guru's Guide*, Chapter III:1). Besides addressing the task of the Schoolhouse Weave, this chapter also addresses the rules of engagement, course architecture, local initiative management, and the continuation phase.

There are eight rules of engagement identified. The fifth one is the most significant in this effort and the others primarily address training specifics. The fifth rule of engagement

provides some insight into the authoritative "tone" of this initiative. It simply states, "*The Little Blue Book* will be used to resolve doctrinal disputes and disputes about the more general aspects of the architecture of the initiative" *(Air Force Core Values—Guru's Guide*, Chapter III:4).

The course architecture section describes how individuals should be educated to the appropriate level based upon their rank and responsibilities. Examples are provided demonstrating how different training methods and the overall depth of the subject changes across the different populations.

Chapter IV—The Continuation Phase

This chapter contains four major sections. These include an overview, the Architectural Control Committee (ArchConCom), ArchConCom responsibilities, and the gurus' network. The main point being that this initiative has been institutionalized and has "process owners" assigned to carry out the plan.

"[T]he purpose of the Continuation Phase is [to] do whatever it takes (in a values driven way) to keep the Core Values initiative going on a long term basis" *(Air Force Core Values—Guru's Guide*, Chapter IV:1). This chapter then introduces the two organizations (one formal and the other informal) that will drive the Continuation Phase. The formal organization is the "ArchConCom," and the informal organization is the "Guru Network."

The ArchConCom is comprised of two subordinate groups: (1) the *Executive Review Board* and (2) the *Working Group*. The responsibilities and authority of each group are documented in this chapter. Both groups consist of a broad range of representatives. The Executive Review Board is comprised of the following senior persons: the Vice Chief of

Staff (Chair) (AF/CV); Commander, Air Education and Training Command (AETC/CC); a MAJCOM CC (appointed on a revolving basis); Superintendent, US Air Force Academy (USAFA/CC); Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel (AF/DP); an SES representative; a general officer from the Air Force Reserve; a general officer from the Air National guard; a retired general officer; and the CMSAF *(Air Force Core Values—Guru's Guide*, Chapter IV:2). The Working Board has a very similar representative structure, but its members are at a much lower grade than their parent executive members. It is noted that although the pamphlet states that the Core Values initiatives also apply to contractors, they are not represented in this group.

Section three of this chapter discusses the ArchConCom responsibilities. The first responsibility includes "connecting the dots", which means to make sure the parts of the plan fit together as designed—such as the Schoolhouse and Field plans *(Air Force Core Values—Guru's Guide*, Chapter IV:3). Other ArchConCom responsibilities include the following: review wing-level continuation plans, maintain the Air Force Core Values website, train HQ Air Force, MAJCOM, DRU, and Wing Gurus, ensure currency and usefulness of commonly available materials, develop responsible, value driven assessment tools, and to serve as the senior leadership liaison *(Air Force Core Values—Guru's Guide*, Chapter IV:3,4).

The last section of this chapter introduces the guru network. "The Guru Network includes all of those persons selected by MAJCOM and wing commanders to serve as their local 'belly buttons' for the Core Values Initiative" *(Air Force Core Values—Guru's Guide*, Chapter IV:5). The document states that these gurus do not come from specific offices or career fields, but rather "should be self-directed, self-starting persons recognized

for their values-driven conduct and attitudes who are fully committed to 'full up' implementation of the Core Values initiative" *(Air Force Core Values—Guru's Guide*, Chapter IV:5). Further responsibilities for the MAJCOM and Wing-level Gurus are defined in this chapter.

Chapter V—Doctrine

This chapter describes how the three Core Values are fundamental and unchanging. There are four sections in this chapter. The first three describe what is meant by each of the three Core Values: Integrity first, Service before self, and Excellence in all we do, respectfully. The fourth section is called "Applying the Core Values." It describes how the Core Values are not a checklist but rather should be thought of as tools to help us meet our professional obligations. This section also identifies "three basic ways in which the Little Blue Book and Core Values doctrine can be used, and these three applications are conveniently referred to as (1) The Compass; (2) The Crystal Ball; and (3) The Bag of Marbles" *(Air Force Core Values—Guru's Guide*, Chapter V:8).

Chapter VI—Supporting Ideas

. This chapter consists of some important concepts, several of which are questioned in this thesis. Table 6 lists the eight subheadings that are discussed in that chapter.

Table 6. Supporting Ideas

A. Pessimism, Optimism, and 'Realism'
B. Personal vs. Organizational Values
C. Character Development
D. "Tipping"
E. Functionalism
F. Chaplains and Chaplain Programs
G. Do-It-Yourself
H. Assessment

Of most importance to this research are the sections on "Personal vs. Organizational Values," "Character Development," "Functionalism," and "Chaplains and Chapel Programs." Each of these concepts are discussed below.

The *Guru's Guide* provides some insightful information concerning the current initiative on each the mentioned topics. The topic of personal versus organizational values, and portions of the section on character development are both addressed later in this chapter under the section, "Role of Character Development in Current Initiative." Additionally, the role of the chaplain is also addressed later n this chapter under the section, "Roles and Responsibilities of the Chaplain in Current Initiative."

Character Development. The current initiative makes it clear that character development is not a primary goal. It states:

> In other words, the Air Force Core Values initiative as such has not set character development as a primary goal. In fact, it is expected that some character development probably will take place in the wake of our efforts

> to weave the Core Values into all education and operations, but that will be a happy byproduct and not a strategic goal.
>
> In this regard it may be useful to view cultural change as occurring when the good people are given a chance to sufficiently influence the 'confused' people so as to move the culture in a positive direction. Those persons who are the 'confused' category may well undergo a character transformation as a result of this experience, but such transformation may not be required to cause cultural change.
>
> Of course, this discussion pertains only to the Core Values initiative and does not bear upon initiatives at USAFA or elsewhere to encourage character development in trainees. *(Air Force Core Values—Guru's Guide,* Chapter VI-3)

These statements leave little doubt that character development is not the focus of this initiative. Not only does the *Guru's Guide* explicitly state that character development is not "a primary goal," but *The United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet* states that "it is not a goal." The *Guru's Guide* adds to the confusion by indicating that character development would be a happy byproduct. Clarification appears to be required here based upon review of other relevant programs and initiatives that clearly indicate subjects of morals, values and ethics are the keys to character development.

Another interesting observation is that the authors of the *Guru's Guide* apparently realize that the Core Values initiative is different from what is taking place at the Air Force Academy and perhaps other training installations. This certainly begs the question, "Should the Air Force strategy really be that different from the Academy's?"

Functionalism. Another important concept that is discussed in this chapter of the guide is the concept of functionalism. In reference to this subject, the *Guru's Guide* states:

> Functionalism is the view that we can find an explanation and (limited) justification for the Core Values by establishing their purpose or function in some concrete application and context. Functionalism tells us that we must

> subscribe to this or that because the Core Value has a clearly identifiable and important function to play in the profession of arms.
>
> Functionalism is not a challenge to other explanations for the Core Values. The Core Values may well have an ultimate foundation, and that foundation may very well be religious in nature, but those facts are consistent with functionalism as the term is used here. Functionalism doesn't rule out religious foundations, but it does say this: regardless of their religious views, all military professionals must obey the Core Values because of the critical function the Core Values play in our business. Saying the Core Values have a purpose or function in no way undermines their authenticity or their ultimate origins. *(Air Force Core Values—Guru's Guide,* Chapter VI:4)

For whatever reason, perhaps because of our current ruling on the issue of separation of church and state, or an in effort not to offend anyone, or being politically correct, or just the fact that no one can empirically prove and identify the spiritual foundation, the fact remains that this initiative makes no attempt to identify the basis of the Core Values. With the exception of the next section on "Chaplains and Chapel Programs," the initiative has very little mention of any spiritual emphasis. For some interviewed, this begged the question, "Do not other organizations place great emphasis on the spiritual dimension when trying to inculcate values and ethics?" A quick answer to this, as this research will show, is yes. Others argued, however, that since this initiative has stated that it does not have the goal of character development, and we are mainly talking about fixing organizations, emphasis on the spiritual dimension is not required. As was already identified in previous discussions, fixing the organization first may not be consistent with current thinking on quality initiatives, character development and leadership development. Consequently, that rationale requires clarification. Without clarification, this program is inconsistent with the emphasis on the spiritual foundation which is present in the Air Force

Academy program. Further discussion can be found in Chapter VI, where Air Force Academy initiatives are discussed.

Chaplains and Chapel Programs. This section of the *Guru's Guide* is short and to the point. It states:

> Given what has been said thus far, it should be obvious why the Core Values initiative should not be a program administered by the Chaplain. If Core Values articulate the price of admission to professional military service—they describe the basic obligations of the air and space warrior—then their proper administration is from within the chain of command.
>
> Likewise, the Core Values initiative in no way competes with extant chapel programs. *(Air Force Core Values—Guru's Guide*, Chapter VI:4)

This section clearly makes an argument that it is not appropriate for the Chaplain to be the administrator of the initiative. Not only that, but no mention is made of what potential role the chaplain might play in this initiative.

These supporting ideas and concepts are contrasted against the previous initiatives in Chapter VII of this research.

Chapter VII—Active Learning

This chapter discusses the advantages and disadvantages of active learning over passive learning. The chapter then describes seven different types of active learning which include modeling, one-way stories, two-way stories, directed discussion, lived experience, simulations, and cases. Each type of active learning is described and the characteristics, techniques, and traps and pitfalls for each method are discussed.

Appendix 1—Tables

This Appendix includes much of the supporting material for previous concepts discussed in the previous seven chapters. These materials include Challenges Axis and

Influence Axis (characteristics of active learning types), a Professional Compass Worksheet, the "Crystal Ball" Application of Core Values Doctrine, a Case Discussion of the Rules of Engagement (ROE), and a matrix which matches respective enlisted and officer courses with learning types.

Appendix 2—Global Engagement: A Vision for the 21st Century Air Force

This Appendix does just what its title implies, provides senior leadership's vision for the entire Air Force "and charts the course of the Air Force into the first quarter of the 21st Century." The significance of the document, as it relates to the Core Values, is that it references the Core Values initiative several times. This adds credence to the emphasis that senior management is placing on this effort and is consistent with on-going efforts external to the Air Force to relate vision, mission and core values.

Appendix 3—USAF Core Values Comprehensive Lesson Plan

This Appendix has five sections and its own four attachments. The five sections include a lesson description, USAF Core Values Strategy, lesson leader information, the lessons, and training strategy. The four Attachments include Lesson Example: Introductory Type, twelve Sample Case Studies, Commander's Guide to Evaluating the Ethical Climate in Your Organization, and a Core Values Climate Survey.

One statement that is made in the third section, "Lesson Leader Information", is relevant to the analysis of the different values related initiatives. It states:

> It should always be remembered that **this is not a values clarification exercise**. The Secretary and Chief of Staff have declared the Core Values for us. The purpose of these directed discussions is for students to discover the relevance and importance of the Air Force Core Values. *There are correct answers, and those answers are found in the Air Force Core Values. (Air Force Core Values—Guru's Guide,* Appendix 3:4)

All of the above documentation concerning the chapters and appendices of the *Guru's Guide* of the current Core Values initiative include background information of which selected key attributes are used in the subsequent analysis.

As was indicated in Chapter I, two of the eight assumptions in the current initiative are critical in this research. Additional information concerning each assumption is provided below.

Role of Character Development in Current Initiative

This subject is directly related to the eighth assumption of the Core Values Strategy which was identified in Chapter I which places the emphasis of the initiative on fixing organizations, not the character of individuals. The Air Force is being careful not to direct attention to the character of individuals as a potential cause for any of the culture of compromise that may exist. This assumption puts the priority on "fixing" the organization rather than the character of respective individuals within the organization. It is written in such a way that leaves the door open for a follow-on character development program at a future date should the policies, process, and procedural changes not adequately fix the organizations.

This issue is further addressed in Chapter VI of the *Guru's Guide*, entitled "Supporting Ideas," the statement is made that the Core Values initiative is not aimed "at fixing people by engineering the organization's culture" *(Air Force Core Values—Guru's Guide*, Chapter VI:3). This section continues by stating:

> …the initiative presupposes that our people are good already and that they will help us improve the culture by 'de-engineering it' or by removing the remnants of past programs and policies that now retard our efforts to

> preserve or achieve an acceptable environment in the Air Force. *(Air Force Core Values—Guru's Guide*, Chapter VI:3)

This statement demands clarification. Does this mean that Air Force personnel are already full of character and no further improvement is needed? No. By attending the majority of a four-day training session to "gurus" on the subject of Core Values, this author was able to listen to discussion concerning this issue. The facilitator of the session made it clear that this does not mean that Air Force personnel are "free of sin" or that we no longer make mistakes. What he said it meant was that people generally know the difference between right and wrong; that they normally do the right thing or at least want to if they are given a chance. The argument is that our organizations sometimes encourage the wrong behavior, like falsifying reports or other measures since the employees know they will be rewarded or reprimanded accordingly. Regardless of the fact that there are practices and policies that do encourage the wrong behavior, this premise that we are "good" will certainly be challenged by some. After all, as pointed out by Dr. Deming and Dr. Covey, humans were responsible for developing these practices and policies.

Some believe a harder and perhaps more important question, can we really "fix" organizations without "fixing" individual character? Chapter VI of the *Guru's Guide*, addresses the issue of "Personal vs. Organizational Values." Even within its own supporting documentation to the initiative, statements exist that indicate the importance of *individuals* accepting these values. This section states:

> Only human beings can recognize and follow values. Organizations 'have' and 'follow' values only in so far as significant numbers of their members have and follow them. Organizational values, therefore, are values shared by a significant number of the members of that organization. The larger the

> number of persons following a set of values, the more likely it is that the organizational climate will be influenced by those values. If many persons are venal careerists, then the atmosphere of the organization will be a poisonous one in which those who are either good or confused will be tempted to follow the example of those who are influencing the atmosphere. *(Air Force Core Values—Guru's Guide*, Chapter VI:2)

Additionally, according to members of the United States Air Force Academy Philosophy Department, who are partially responsible for implementation of the current Core Values initiative training, workers essentially have two options: they can either accept the values and make them their own, or they can leave the organization. This type of ultimatum is not new. In a different study, Brende states, "Officers whose value systems differ radically from the 'military norm' are faced with the choice of adapting to this norm or separating from the service" (1986:2).

Chapter VI of the *Guru's Guide* also states some fairly strong words concerning those who do not adopt the Core Values. It states:

> Obviously, it is only possible for our members to subscribe to values that are not consistent with the purposes of the organization. Those persons must realize they are potential liabilities for the organization, and will be dealt with accordingly. The Core Values initiative in no way requires them to give up the values they hold, but it *does* require them to hold those values *outside* the Air Force and in another line of work. Those who cannot subscribe to the Core Values must leave the service. *(Air Force Core Values—Guru's Guide*, Chapter VI:2-3)

Despite the above statements, there is no additional mechanism in place to enforce an individual to respond to one of the two options identified above outside of such things as the pre-established Honor System, and the Unified Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). In other words, individuals really have a third option of "behaving" in an appropriate manner even though they have not truly accepted the Air Force Core Values as their own, i.e., they can fake having the Core Values. The current initiative is silent on enforcement.

The United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet states in the second section, "Why These Core Values," that "the first reason is that the Core Values tell us the price of admission to the Air Force itself." By making the Core Values explicit, the Air Force hopes to lay the groundrules so that its people are aware of the expectations and demands placed upon them. By doing this the Air Force also hopes that its new recruits will not only be aware of the values the Air Force believes in , but also be more likely to personally embrace these same values as their own. The rationale for this is that not many individuals would want to work in an environment where the organization's values are always conflicting with the individual's personal values. Since all Air Force personnel and organizations uphold these same Core Values, it seems reasonable to assume that all Air Force personnel will also be expected to embrace and live by these values. Each of the above statements, appear to be more relevant to individuals than to organizational changes.

Several examples of the intended/implied audience of *The United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet*, may show how this booklet is directed and focused to individual employees within organizations, as much if not more than it is towards organizations themselves.

The pamphlet directs many statements to all of the United States Air Force employees and contractors. The pamphlet addresses the employees throughout the document with such terms and phrases as: "all members of the Air Force," "persons," "we," "our," 'all of us," "professionals," "they," "themselves," "those," "such persons," "commanders," "leaders," "subordinates," "all of us," and "you." These are the "subjects" within the document who are to accept and live by these values. There are a multitude of examples

within the pamphlet that could be referenced. For purposes of not re-writing the majority of the pamphlet, just the first two paragraphs from the first section, "Definitions," are provided below. Italics and underlines have been added to highlight the emphasis placed on the individual's character.

> Integrity is a *character trait*. It is the willingness to do what is right even when no one is looking. It is the "*moral compass*"—the *inner voice*; the *voice of self-control*; the basis for the trust imperative in today's military.
>
> Integrity is the ability to hold together and properly regulate all of the elements of a personality. *A person* of integrity, for example, is capable of acting on conviction. *A person* of integrity can control impulses and appetites. (*The United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet*).

There is little doubt that the stated goal of fixing organizations is a worthwhile one. The problem lies with the last part of the eighth assumption that states "long before we seek to implement a character development program, we must thoroughly evaluate and, where necessary, fix our policies, processes, and procedures" *(The United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet*). The pamphlet provides much of its emphasis on the values that individual Air Force employees need to obtain and live by. Organizational improvement is also addressed throughout the pamphlet, however, it does not appear to receive the same emphasis that individual values receives in this initiative. Lastly, authors like Covey would indicate personal change must precede organizational change. Further discussion and clarification can be found in Chapter VII.

The second assumption relevant in this thesis concerns the role and responsibility of the chaplain.

Roles and Responsibilities of the Chaplain in Current Initiative

The chaplains do not have a particular role in this initiative outside of their current day-to-day responsibilities. These include such things as conducting religious services, Bible studies, and counseling just to name a few. In several rare occasions a chaplain may be assigned as a "guru" for a respective organization. As an example, only one of the twenty-nine individuals attending the AFMC Core Values Guru Training was a chaplain, and the office that he was supporting was HQ AFMC/HC (the chaplain's office). According to Lieutenant Colonel Dunford, the lead AETC Core Values training representative, this sample was not unusual. Lieutenant Colonel Dunford stated that typically there is either one or in most cases zero chaplains who attend the respective command training.

When questioned whether he thought the chaplains should be responsible as the "gurus" since one their functions over time has typically been responsible to advise the commander concerning values or character related initiatives, Lieutenant Colonel Dunford replied that this initiative was not based on functions or "being stove-piped."

This is very different from the perspective shared by others, including several of the chaplains that were interviewed who believed that the chaplains ought to play a larger role in the Core Values initiative. Another proponent of better utilizing the chaplain is General White who stated in a recent *Airpower Journal* article the following:

> We need to help our people build an internal moral compass, utilizing the Chaplain corps for that purpose. We need to encourage and enable our chaplains to teach spiritual principles of ethical behavior—not just philosophy—from the viewpoint of their religious beliefs. The Ten Commandments and the book of Proverbs are a good place to begin, since they contain tenets accepted by almost all faiths. We certainly should not coerce people into religious instruction, but we can and should encourage

> them. I emphasize this aspect because religious belief calls for an integral transformation rather than just a change in behavior. Interestingly, hardly any secular literature even mentions religious instruction as part of the solution—a puzzling exclusion in view of the impressive historical place such instruction holds in forming the moral concepts of our nation. (1996:96)

General White makes several statements that provide perspectives on several of the issues in this study. First he states that he believes the chaplains should be involved in initiatives that deal with ethical behavior. At the time of this article, senior leadership had begun discussions concerning core values, but the initiative itself had not yet started its implementation and other supporting details such as to who would be responsible for its implementation and its assumptions and purpose were also undetermined. General White also makes a direct connection between spiritual principles and ethical behavior and provides several examples of material that he believes the chaplains could use as a basis of the training. He also makes the observation that secular literature generally fails to even mention religious instruction as a potential solution.

The Air Force approach, which appears to utilize the chaplain less, seems to be against the trend that is taking place in the Army:

> Interestingly, increased attention seems to be occurring on the use of Army chaplains. The recent headlines of the *Army Times* stated, "Army Chaplains always have a source of counseling and spiritual guidance for soldiers. In the wake of Aberdeen, their services may be needed now more than ever" (Ledford, May 19, 1997:cover). Along the same lines of who should be or at least has been involved in such training, a different *Army Times* article stated, "the survey showed 80 percent of the ethics instruction was being done by chaplains, in amounts ranging from one to 80 hours per year" (Willis, June 16, 1997:12).

This issue is one that is surely worth further investigation.

Additional Findings

One of the most educational experiences received through the literature review was attending the majority of a four-day training session on Core Values. This particular session was given to representatives from throughout the Air Force Materiel Command (AFMC) who were identified by their commanders to be a "guru." During this session many questions were asked and answered concerning the gurus' fears and responsibilities. This session also provided the author several opportunities to meet face-to-face with one of the two individuals responsible for training the "gurus," Lieutenant Colonel Dunford. During these interviews, Lieutenant Colonel Dunford was helpful in explaining some of the premises and rationale behind the initiative. Lieutenant Colonel Dunford believed that the Core Values initiative is "a very well thought out plan…the first cohesive architecture that is aligned throughout the organizations," that he is aware of during his career in the Air Force. Lieutenant Colonel Dunford also gave all of the credit to senior Air Force leaders including Secretary Widnall, General Fogleman, General Stein, General Boles and General Rankin who were responsible for providing the guidance and their continued support for the initiative.

Lieutenant Colonel Dunford also emphasized during the training session that this is a long term effort and that significant results were not immediately anticipated in the short term. Rather, this initiative is partly a result of Joint vision 2010 which provides guidance toward year 2025.

Several skeptical discussions arose over the four-day period. One of the issues that concerned the gurus was what their role was going to be at the completion of the four-day training session. Although they had they opportunity to learn a lot on the subject of Core

Values, some were left with some major concerns as to how they were going to accomplish the next step. This next step included meeting with the commander of the respective organization and assisting the commander in developing an implementation plan.

The training session consisted of active learning, where the individuals were encouraged to actively participate. Active learning is also emphasized in the supporting documentation of the initiative as important if the training is to really be effective. The problem that some were left with was the simple realization that there was not sufficient time to teach all the personnel in their organization if this same strategy were to be used.

In addition to this, many of the gurus did not feel qualified to go back to their organization and adequately address the actions that need to be taken to their commander concerning the Core Values initiative. Explanation was provided that clarified that what needed to be done was to encourage discussions on the Core Values in "natural environments," which include such opportunities as discussions during briefings, performance appraisals and through the mentoring process. Emphasis was made that the intent of this effort was not to be a "program," but rather an everyday natural occurrence that takes place in natural opportunities. It was also stated by the facilitators that in many cases there have been commands that have run out and delivered a Core Values briefing in a "check that box" mentality, without understanding the real architecture behind the initiative.

Another concern that arose during the four-day guru training session, was that we would create a group of "Core Values Police" who always run around looking for someone that messed up so that they could report them. This was highly discouraged by

the facilitators of the discussion. When the subject of trying to change people came up, it was made clear that this initiative is not trying to change people, but rather identify the important values of the Air Force that Air Force personnel need to maintain. Stated another way, the Air Force was not trying to change people, but rather the Air Force only wants to employ individuals that already have or can accept and adopt these Core Values as their own. If an Air Force employee cannot or chooses not to adopt and live by these values, it was stated that they ought to work elsewhere.

Concerning dismissal or the ability to resign from the Air Force, it was noted that enlisted personnel do not have the same rights as officers and civilians. If an officer or civilian desired to resign, assuming that there were no educational or other type of commitment, they could request it and it is generally approved. This is not the case for enlisted personnel. If they find that they do not ascribe to the identified Air Force Core Values they do not have this right to immediately resign, they generally must serve their entire enlistment.

Discussion also arose concerning what was the plan to provide continual education to the DOD civilians and contractors concerning these values. This turns out to be one the issues that has yet to be fully addressed. Although the architecture provides several opportunities for continuing education, these are mostly directed towards military personnel. The accession and PME schools that have or are incorporating Core Values training into their curriculums are directed primarily at military, not DOD civilians. It is even less clear how the Air Force plans to provide the necessary training to contractors. The facilitators stated that this is one of the primary reasons for the continuation weave,

which includes doing whatever it takes over the long term to keep communications and the initiative going.

The last discussion that was conducted before the training concluded was on the subject of how values could be measured. Several thoughts were provided concerning this area from the facilitators, although the facilitators also recognized that their discussion just "scratched the surface." The facilitators did not recommend pursuing any measurement unless they gurus were required to do so from their commanders. The next recommendation was to continue to utilize the existing measures that the organization already tracks. Improvements in their current measures could provide an indication of improved values. If an organization was tasked to conduct measurements and they used techniques such as statistical process control (SPC), further training may be required if they were already not experienced in that area since there was just not ample time to sufficiently address that technique.

The bottom line is that this subject is pretty open-ended and how or if this needs to be done is not agreed upon. This subject requires further clarification.

Summary

The Core Values initiative is *not* a set of uncoordinated activities with no strategic plan or set of objectives. On the contrary, the initiative has received much support from Air Force senior leadership and by all indications will exist in the Air Force for the foreseeable future.

The initiative is well documented. The primary document supporting the initiative is *The Little Blue Book*. This book is being distributed throughout the Air Force and is the

primary reference for each Air Force employee concerning the Core Values. Additional supporting documentation is also provided on the Air Force Core Values Website. Specific information is also available for the "gurus" who will be responsible for training across each respective command on the Air Force Core Values Website. This documentation includes the overall plan concerning how all of the required training will take place. Sufficient detail is provided concerning the respective tools and concepts necessary to implement the training.

The Core Values initiative clearly states that the strategy exists independently of and does not compete with chapel programs and that conducting individual character development is not a goal. Nevertheless, *The Little Blue Book* and the *Guru's Guide* both provide multiple statements that also appear to be interested in improving individual character.

Lastly fixing organizations first appears to be in conflict with the philosophies of both Deming and Covey. This is an area that is discussed in Chapter VII, where it is identified as an area needing further clarification.

Chapter 5

Review of Similar Air Force Values-Related Initiatives Through the 1993 Core Values Program

Chapter Overview

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a description of related Air Force initiatives to the current Air Force Core Values initiative starting from the creation of the Air Force. This chapter discusses all previous values-related initiatives up to General McPeak's Core Values Program, which began in 1993.

Literature Review

In this project, the author sought out values-related initiatives and direction concerning the inculcation of values. This search for values-related initiatives identified several Air Force efforts that were established to improve individual character. As was mentioned in the previous chapter, other relevant programs and initiatives clearly indicate that the subjects of morals, values and ethics are the keys to character development.

Air Force Related Initiatives

This section reviews the several related initiatives that were found. These programs cover the time period immediately prior to the creation of the Air Force, through the 1993

Core Value initiative under General McPeak. Five previous Air Force initiatives were identified in addition to some background to the Air Force Chaplain program through interviews and document analysis. These related initiatives include:

1. Air Force Chaplain Program (1949)
2. Character Guidance Program (1948)
3. Dynamics of Moral Leadership Program (1957)
4. Moral Leadership Program (1961)
5. Adult Values Education (AVE) (1974)
   Values Clarification
6. The 1993 Core Values initiative started by General McPeak

Additionally, programs at the Air Force Academy are identified separately in the next chapter.

Pre-Air Force Character Guidance

The subject of character guidance dates back well before the creation of the Air Force. Jorgensen traces character training, albeit a little different from our current character development 'programs', back to the intangible element known as morale. According to Jorgensen, "Gen. George Washington often used his general orders to discuss such moral subjects as prejudice, profanity, freedom, loyalty, and individual responsibility" (1961:251-252). The subject of morale continued to be stressed throughout both the Civil War and WWII. Jorgensen stated:

> In the Civil War, both the Union and the Confederate Armies stressed morale through lectures, discussion, religious services, and magazines. In World War I, morale building through education, lectures, recreational activities, and religious services was made the responsibility both of chaplains and such civilian agencies as the Knights of Columbus, Salvation Army, and the YMCA. (1961:252)

As can be inferred through the above discussion, the term "morale" back in this time period included a broad spectrum of areas and was used a little differently than is currently used today.

Another statement is provided by Jorgensen which provides some insight into the type of responsibilities that the chaplain had during the 1930's. It states, "During the 1930's chaplains gave sex morality lectures and Citizens Military Training Corps (CMTC) lectures at which attendance was required" (Jorgensen, 1961:252).

External to the Air Force, questions were raised in the 1930s as to whether public schools were the proper place to teach these principles. According to Jorgensen, "Some educators pointed to the fallacy of expecting people to live according to moral values which they had not been taught" (1961:251). Jorgensen provided the following documentation in support of this concern and how these discussions had continued into the 1940's:

> This was apparent in World War II. Informed leaders were concerned that such a large percentage of American youth were rejected from military service as "unfit" even with the most liberal interpretation of physical and mental standards. The alarming rate of venereal disease was traced to a deficiency of moral stamina. Morals had been taken for granted. Something more than a shot of penicillin was involved. The moral debacle of young occupation troops in Germany and Japan was nauseating to behold, but, like a stomach ache, it made leaders realize something was wrong. While the Nazis and the Communists relied heavily on indoctrination, we had taken it for granted that Americans, by merely being Americans, knew the meaning of democracy and were descent God-fearing men. (1961:251)

Jorgensen was arguing that America had not been adequately teaching or inculcating values to that generation but rather just assumed that the soldiers were God-fearing men.

The concerns that this might be the case arose from leaders as a result of the many immoral activities that were taking place.

Although the chaplains had previously played a role in the area of morale, events in the 1940's led to greater confusion as to what role the chaplain ought to play. According to Jorgensen, the following events transpired:

> in 1940, a Morale Division was established in the Office of the Adjutant General, and in 1941 it was redesigned the Morale Branch and made part of the War Department Special Staff. In 1942 this work was renamed the Special Services Branch with the dual function of handling recreation and education, but in 1943 the branch was divided into two parts: athletics and recreation being retained by Special Services while Army news services, orientation, research on troop attitudes, and off-duty education comprised the work of a division called Information and Education. The initial failure to include chaplains in the highest level of discussions where policies were made resulted in confusion at base level concerning the chaplain's role. While chaplains were advisors to their commanders on "morale" and gave required sex morality lectures, their efforts were not coordinated with Special Services and Information and Education officers except on their own initiative. (1961:252)

Jorgensen then explains how this shortcoming was overcome. He states:

> This deficiency was overcome in initial planning for the Universal Military Training Experimental Unit when the chief of Chaplains suggested that the program include 25 periods of instruction in citizenship and morality by chaplains, a proposal that was adopted and put into effect at Fort Knox in 1946. The Chaplain School, then located at Fort Oglethorpe, was asked to prepare the lectures.
>
> These lectures were so well received at Fort Knox that Secretary of War Patterson in 1947 ordered the same kind of training to be used throughout the Army. Important in this entire development was the advisory work of the President's Committee on Religion and Moral Welfare and Character Guidance in [the] Armed Forces appointed by President Truman. (1961:252)

It is also important to define the subject of morale, especially around the time frame in question, as it appears to have carried an additional meaning than we would think of as it is defined today. According to Funk & Wagnalls, Morale is defined as:

> **1** State of mind with reference to confidence, courage, hope, etc.: used especially of a number of persons associated with some enterprise, as troops, workers, etc. **2** Morality. (1956:772).

This may add some insight into what role the chaplain played in relation to the subject of morale. Regardless of whether this second definition was a more accurate explanation of the chaplains' role, the first definition would certainly still allow the chaplain to encourage the troops with spiritual teachings in an effort to raise their confidence, courage, and hopes. The definition of moral in this same dictionary also provides one definition that refers to morale. It states, "Of or influencing morals or morale; as, moral force" (1956:772).

With this historical foundation, the Air Force began its Character Guidance Program.

Early Air Force Policy

As briefly identified above, the desire to inculcate values and develop character has existed for many years, probably since the beginning of time. This is not to say that the subject has always been emphasized as strongly throughout each decade as this document just suggested was not the case in the 1930s and early 1940s. From an Air Force perspective, the USAF Guidance Program began around October 1948 when President Truman established the President's Committee on Religious and Moral Welfare and Character Guidance in the Armed Forces, under Executive Order number 10013. A portion of the Executive Order is provided below:

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Government to encourage and promote the religious, moral, and recreational welfare and character guidance of persons in the armed forces and thereby to enhance the military preparedness and security of the Nation.
>
> The Committee shall consider means of effectuating the policy set forth in paragraph 1 hereof through maximum feasible reliance upon facilities and

> services now existing in the fields of work concerned, confer and advise with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force with respect to such means, appraise the work being done toward the effectuation of the said policy, and make such recommendations to the President and the said Secretaries as it shall deem appropriate. (Code of Federal Regulations, Title 3—The President, 1943-1948 Compilation:835-836)

This Executive Order implied a relationship in the encouragement and promotion of such areas as religious, moral, recreational welfare, and character guidance to the military preparedness and security of the Nation. This is very similar to the statement made by General Curtis LeMay and is the thesis of this research. He states in the Foreword of the History of the Air Force Chaplains, *Air Force Chaplains 1947-1960*, Volume II:

> Freedom of worship is one of America's priceless heritages[.] Religious faith emphasizes that nothing is more important than the individual, that the course of history will be determined by what the individual does or does not do. This conviction is important in an effective defense force. No matter how advanced our weapon systems become, their effective use depends on men who are technically proficient, morally stable, patient in future or success, self-controlled in decision, and loyal in sublimating personal goals to the national good. The alert readiness of the Air Force and the new frontiers of the space age place a high premium on men of character and ability. The effort of each one is important to the strength of our country. (Curtis E. LeMay, Chief of Staff of the Air Force)

General LeMay makes the case here again that the individual is the most important, even above advanced weapon systems. He also emphasizes, what others have previously been quoted to have said throughout this document, that there is great need for men of "character and ability."

The Executive Order also directed the Committee to consider use of existing facilities and services for effective implementation. Many of the initiatives made use of chaplains as a frequent "instrument" in such initiatives. A new Executive Order in 1949, number 10043, changed the name of the President's Committee on Religious and Moral Welfare

and Character Guidance in the Armed Forces, to the President's Committee on Religious and Moral Welfare in the Armed Forces (Code of Federal Regulations, Title 3—The President, 1949-1953 Compilation:231).

Air Force Chaplain Program

Interestingly, although the Air Force was established as a separate department on 18 September 1947, it was not until 10 May 1949 that the Air Force was granted the establishment of its own chaplaincy by a "transfer order," and not until 26 July 1949 that this transfer from the Army had taken place (Jorgensen, 1961:7-8).

Jorgensen further explains the basic functions of a chaplain as defined by the Air Force in 1948 by quoting from AFR 165-3: "A chaplain in the Air Force is primarily a minister of religion, and as such is the advisor to the commanding general or commanding officer on all matters pertaining to the religious life, morals, and character-building factors within a given command" (Jorgensen, 1961:62). This same regulation states: "Chaplains will not be detailed to duties other than those required of them by law or pertaining to their specialty in the field of religion except when an extreme military emergency exists" (Jorgensen, 1961:62). These statements both lay out the basic functions of the chaplain and also greatly scope the possible duties that can be assigned to the chaplain. The chaplains were considered to be the experts in these respective areas, as the terms "advisor to the commanding general" and "to their specialty in the field of religion" both imply. From the beginning, the Air Force had identified the chaplain as key to all matters pertaining to the area of character-building.

Since the Air Force had separated from the Army, it was necessary to develop its own regulations. The Air Force published the "Air Force Chaplain's Program" (AFR 165-3),

on 7 December 1948. "This regulation replaced previous Army and Air Force directives and was the first outline of the position, activities, and responsibilities of chaplains on duty with the Air Force" (Jorgensen, 1961:8). This regulation clearly defined the responsibilities of the commanding officers. It stated, "Commanding officers are ultimately as completely responsible for the religious life, morals, and morale within their commands as they are for strictly military affairs" (Jorgensen, 1961:8). This is important to note since over time some individuals have misunderstood that this has always been the case. In the more recent two Core Values initiatives, commanders have personally been required to take a more active role in the initiatives, but they have always been ultimately responsible for these areas.

Character Guidance Program (1948)

An indication of both the chaplain's role and the significance placed on the Character Guidance Program was provided by Jorgensen. He described how character guidance councils were established in 1948 and how they existed from Departments down to the wing-based level. Concerning the role of the chaplain and its audience, Jorgensen stated, "The Chaplain held a significant position in the program from the first, and all men were required to attend character guidance lectures" (1961:252).

Concerning the specifics of the chaplain's role, Jorgensen also states:

> The chaplain's major contribution to this program—aside from his participation as a staff officer in the character guidance council and staff meetings—was the required lecture. From 1948 to 1958 chaplains were required to give a lecture once a month to all assigned military personnel on topics suggested by AFPCH. This specific responsibility was mentioned in the "Chaplain Program" series of regulations for the first time in 1954 though it was contained in the regulations on character guidance since 1948 on. (1961:253)

The AFPCH was an acronym used for the Office of the Chief of Chaplains.

In terms of the format and content of these lectures, the chaplains prepared lectures:

> on the basis of natural theology showing the religious and moral aspects of citizenship, geared to an intellectual level of 12 years, approximately 4,000 words in length for a 20- to 25-minute presentation, and including a bibliography and discussion questions. (Jorgensen, 1961:254)

In 1947, the lectures were renamed "The Chaplain's Hour." According to Jorgensen, "a total of 80 instructional units had been prepared. Selected lectures were assembled into four manuals, and in 1950 the lectures were revised and published in six Army-Air Force pamphlets entitled, 'Duty, Honor, Country.'" (1961:254). The list of lectures indicates the scope of the subjects that were covered. Several examples of these subjects include: Personal Integrity, Honesty, Our Citizenship, Clean Thinking and Living, Home, Sincerity, Prejud[i]ce, Thrift, The Hardest Victory, and As You Would Be Done By (Jorgensen, 1961:254).

A brochure entitled "Brochure on the United States Air Force Character Guidance Program was developed by AFPCH in 1949. The brochure identified four objectives, several of which resemble the Air Force's current Core Values initiative. According to Jorgensen:

> The brochure stated that Character Guidance Councils should have four objectives: first the development of intelligent moral leadership; second, a practical program of character building activities; third, means of identifying and combating corruptive influences; fourth, the solution of personal problems through personal counseling. (1961:253)

Just the presence of a brochure certainly does not by itself constitute a successful program or one that is necessarily taken seriously. Documentation exists, however, that indicates how widespread and seriously taken the program was. Jorgensen provides the following examples:

> Dr. Daniel Poling in his 1949 visit to military units in the Pacific reported, 'The most interesting and worthwhile experience of my tour was meeting character guidance councils at each place.…Everywhere I found the Army, Navy and Air Force seriously concerned with promoting comprehensive character guidance and I only wish that every community at home were equally concerned. (1961:253)

Jorgensen also references a statement made by Chief of Chaplains, Chaplain Carpenter, that character guidance councils should be composed of "the top policy advisors to the commander" and should be concerned with everything that happened to people (1961:253). This statement is consistent with the earlier mentioned mission of the chaplain as identified in AFR 165-3. Being concerned with everything that happened to *people* as distinguished from materiel, weapons, or aircraft is important in understanding the role of the chaplain.

An interesting observation should be made here concerning the current Air Force Core Values initiative. Through discussions with the Core Values training facilitators and through observation, it was estimated that approximately half of the individuals who have most recently been identified as "gurus" are from the personnel field, which by definition is also concerned with "people" issues. Since both organizations are concerned with people issues, this begs the question of which specialty is more suitable or qualified to conduct the responsibilities identified for the guru, or is either sufficient?

Concerning the breadth of the character guidance councils within the Air Force, Jorgensen references a statement made in 1949 by General Curtis E. LeMay, Commanding General of Strategic Air Command. General LeMay reported, "We now have character guidance councils established at all echelons of command through base level for the

purpose of planning an integrated and unified program of character development" (1961:253).

Despite the program's apparent success stories, the requirement to have character guidance councils meet and report quarterly was ultimately dropped in 1956. Similar issues, as the confusion that occurred in the early 1940's concerning who had what responsibilities, may have been the cause of the programs cancellation. According to Jorgensen, Chaplain Stephen Tatar reported:

> Many councils did not show any understanding of their purpose and functions. The cause of the confusion may have been the fact that morale and morals are a responsibility of command, and items important to character development council are important to the commander.

The potential confusion concerning responsibility seems reasonable given the recent changes that have taken place in the latest two Core Values initiatives where more and more responsibility has been directed to the commander and away from chaplains. Some have misinterpreted this to mean that the chaplain use to be responsible, where in reality the commander has always been responsible for the success of the initiatives. Commanders have merely delegated this responsibility more in the past than they are permitted to today.

According to Jorgensen, the purpose of the Character Guidance Program, as stated in the 1956 regulation, was as follows, "The aim of the Air Force character guidance program is to help each individual develop a code of personal conduct that recognizes his responsibility to proper authority and encourages him to do his best as a member of the Air Force team" (1961:253).

Jorgensen also states:

> By 1957 there was a feeling that a new program was needed. The lectures which had served a good purpose needed to be brought up to date, in keeping with the rapid tempo of events and problems in the field of human relations. Further, some commanders and staff chaplains felt that a new name was needed. There was also the problem of relating the lectures to specific audiences. (1961:254-255)

Because of these issues, the Dynamics of Moral Leadership lecture (DML) program was launched in the fall of 1957, with publication of AFR 165-7.

Dynamics of Moral Leadership Program (1957)

The purpose of this program was "to keep military personnel aware of those principles of moral leadership which are essential to the accomplishment of the Air Force mission" (Jorgensen, 1961:255). This program included quarterly lectures to three different groups. These groups included officers (through the grade of lieutenant colonel), noncommissioned officers, and enlisted personnel. With respect for who was responsible for the development and presentation of these lectures, Jorgensen states:

> AFPCH planned appropriate topics for the three groups, requested 122 chaplains to prepare lectures, mimeographed selected lectures, and sent them to all base chaplains in time for presentation. The Chaplains' Board began to prepare lecture materials in 1959. (1961:255)

As inferred from the above statement, it appears that different topics were taught to the three different groups. The extent of this is unknown as it is not explicitly stated in the documentation.

The use of live lectures were found to be much more effective than the use of posters and filmstrips which were discontinued in 1956 and 1957 respectively (Jorgensen, 1961:256). Some claimed that the use of lectures for character guidance had a positive

impact on the number of visits the chaplain received as well as an increase in church attendance. Jorgensen stated:

> An enthusiastic, dynamic use of the opportunity presented through character guidance lectures had far reaching results. Chaplain William Clasby, in the 1954 Staff Chaplains' Conference, told how a vigorous lecture program increased attendance at all religious services in the Second Air Force and in Alaska. Chaplain Charles E. Byrd, in 1960, said, "I have made as many contacts which have developed spiritual growth through Dynamics of Moral Leadership lectures as I have through preaching. They have come to me for counseling on spiritual, personal, and family problems, on the strength of having heard me." After a lecture, many an airman remarked, "The Chaplain gave me something to think about." (1961:256)

Starting in 1955, the chaplain's lectures on citizenship and morality were part of the military training (Jorgensen, 1961:256). Jorgensen summarized the effectiveness of the program by stating, "The acceptance of the program and its results in terms of morale and morals made it one of the significant achievements in character education" (1961:256). According to Jorgensen, in 1960 the program was renamed Moral Leadership Training (1961:255).

Moral Leadership Program (1961)

In describing the setting of the Sixties in which this program existed, Scharlemann wrote:

> By 1960 the so-called religious revival of the Fifties had receded. In fact, a kind of reaction had set in against religious institutions. The revolutionary changes taking place on an almost universal scale persuaded some theologians that men no longer needed to depend on faith in a divine being. (1971:15)

Concerning the Air Force Moral Leadership Program, Scharlemann continued by stating:

> In this same period the moral leadership program, implemented by Air Force chaplains since the birth of USAF on 18 September 1947, met growing opposition. In fact, the whole effort was canceled on July 1, 1966 for all personnel except those in basic training, technical schools, the officer

> candidate school, and WAF instruction. During the first six months of 1960, chaplains presented a total of 1,302 moral leadership lectures to 102,000 people. (1971:15)

This event appears to be pivotal since attendance to this type of program was no longer mandatory for the majority of Air Force personnel. The Moral Leadership Program continued, but only to a much smaller audience.

Interestingly, during this same decade that Scharlemann described as one where men were falling away from their need of a God, he also states that "There was much talk of church renewal. The revised Air Force Regulation 265-1 of 2 September 1966 for the first time included a reference to spiritual renewal as part of the chaplain program" (Scharlemann, 1971:15). He accredits much of this to the completion of the Second Vatican Council, which adjourned on 8 December 1965 (1971:15). There were other discussions as to "getting chaplains out of uniform to keep them from identifying too closely with the military establishment" (Scharlemann, 1971:15). Scharlemann also mentioned that, "As early as 1963 the Church-State Committee of the American Civil Liberties Union began a thorough study of all aspects of the military chaplaincy with a view to challenging its legitimacy" (1971:15).

Adult Values Education (AVE) (1974)

This program was also known as "Values Clarification" up until 1988, when the concept of clarifying values was no longer deemed effective. AVE continued. however, until the 1993 Core Values Program. The Seventies, like the previous decades, brought changes to the chaplain's role. According to Groh:

> In the Air Force, the traditional role of chaplains in the Moral Leadership program changed radically during the decade. The chaplain's compulsory appearance before Air Force personnel was modified in strategic ways, and

> as a much more person-centered format emerged for the various Adult Values Education (AVE) programs that were still compulsory in Air Training Command, and sometimes in other commands or bases. (1986:609)

Groh provided additional insights into "the transition that occurred as chaplains and other concerned parties traversed the 'bridge' between moral leadership and Adult Values Education programs (1986:609).

During the Seventies, Adult Values Education was accomplished but not in the compulsory manner it had previously been taught in earlier initiatives. There were several groups to whom the training was still mandatory, but relatively few. One possible explanation for this is that it was during the time period immediately following the ruling that cadets at the three service academies no longer had to attend mandatory chapel. It stands to reason that if a similar decision was just relaxed for Academy cadets, people probably argued that they also did not need to receive this education. According to Groh:

> As the decade opened chaplains were required by AFR 50-31, Moral Leadership (October 24, 1969), at the commander's request, to provide moral leadership training to personnel, primarily during their first year of service. The office of the Chief of Chaplains was responsible for providing training materials. (1986:609)

Groh made it clear that other commanders outside of ATC were certainly allowed and sometimes did ask chaplains to conduct Moral Leadership or AVE programs for their personnel, but this was not mandated. A respective commander could choose to mandate the training within their command or at other bases, but again this decision was not regulated. It varied on a case by case, commander by commander basis (1986:613).

According to Groh, a full review of the Moral Leadership and the chaplain's role in the program was ordered by the Chief of Chaplains in 1970. This review was called the Moral Leadership Planning Conference and it produced a major report, entitled BRIDGE,

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Revision of the USAF Moral Leadership Program. The report proposed the following:

> a three-part, person centered-education program. Part one, limited to the Air Training Command, called for a continuation, but revision of the current ML program for all first term airmen in training environments. Part two proposed a program integrated into commander's calls and the Air Force Now film program. The third part of the proposal suggested voluntary activities developed to fit local situations and the capabilities of local chaplains. (1986:609-610)

Another primary objective of this conference was to examine the rationale for the ML program. According to Groh, the report indicated an inadequate foundation existed

> upon which to build a *chaplain* identified, sponsored, conducted and controlled program now. The changing public mood, new legal considerations and restraints, increased education and growing social and political awareness of the young, the agonizing redefinition of the church and of the role of the clergymen, changing force structure, growing concern within church bodies concerning the military chaplain's function, all mitigate against the continuation of the present rationale. (1986:610)

The BRIDGE report marked a major change in the basic philosophy upon which previous character guidance, morals and values initiatives had been taught. Up until this point, the chaplains had been actively involved as the experts and advisors to the commanders. The chaplains were generally responsible for the moral training of the workforce. They had been free to a large degree to share their personal beliefs and the foundation upon which they were based. Now, the BRIDGE report established a new rationale, which posited three major assumptions:

> the maturity and self-responsibility of Air Force members had to be assumed; any new ML program was to be marked by candor, a balanced view of history, and "a contemporary and authentic approach to ethical and moral questions;" third, "any new chaplain-conducted moral leadership program must be non-manipulative, not focusing its attention towards the need of the chaplain or of the institution, but directed towards the needs of the serviceman himself. (Groh, 1986:610)

In other words, the new approach was based much more on contemporary approaches with a balance of many perspectives, rather than being driven by the chaplain as had been done in the past. The statement that "the maturity and self-responsibility of Air Force members had to be assumed," is interesting in that it is very similar to the current premise that is made in the Air Force initiative that "people are good." Up until the BRIDGE report, that was not the assumption that was made.

According to Groh:

> Early in 1972 the *Chaplain Newsletter* announced that "a completely new moral leadership program is now in being. Moral leadership training for active duty personnel will be mandatory only for students, enlisted and officers, in ATC. Other commanders, however, may request moral leadership training support from their chaplains." The new program emphasized dialogue rather than lecture, using commercial films if possible to raise issues and stimulate response. (1986:610)

The ATC Chaplain's office introduced the idea of values clarification in the fall of 1973 in an attempt to develop improved techniques for what was called the 'Moral Leadership (Values Clarification) Program in Air Training Command' (Groh, 1986:611). The major resource leader of this movement was Dr. Sidney B. Simon, a nationally known leader in values education from the University of Massachusetts (Groh, 1986:611).

When the ATC Chaplain's were asked to comment on a proposed revision of the ML regulation, AFR 50-31, they responded in the fall of 1973 that the regulation should be renamed "Values Education" (Groh, 1986:611).

> According to the proposed revision, the chief objective was to "provide a training program of Values Education which presents a reasonable and functional system of human values in formulating ethical decision in personal and military life, and community relations. It emphasizes human values and goals, self-responsibility, focuses on the worth and dignity of each human personality, and presents an authentic approach to ethical and

> moral questions, be they individual, societal, or related to military service." (Groh, 1986:611)

AVE, which is sometimes synonymously referred to as Values Clarification, was more concerned with drawing out the individual's personal values than trying to inculcate or change the respective employees values. Under AVE, little to no attention was placed on whether an individual's respective value was right or wrong, but rather it merely helped the individual understand what his or her values really were. According to Groh:

> AVE was a developmental program with a person-centered approach that sought to meet people in their life situations, and help them take charge of their own living and learning. "Discovering self, taking charge of one's life, becoming more responsible to self, becoming more accountable to others"—these were the goals of the new AVE programs. Its methodology was one of questioning, reflecting, dialogizing, and discovering. It was called an "andragogical" program, relying on the science of facilitating adult learning, as opposed to pedagogy. Some suggested that the ML program was institutionally-oriented, authoritarian, a program that portrayed the chaplain as a transmitter of social and cultural values. The new AVE program, in contrast, was portrayed as person-oriented, non-authoritarian, involving the chaplain as a facilitator who assisted the individual in identifying and clarifying values. (1986:611-612)

Kilpatrick confirmed this statement by providing the promotional blurb on the back cover of the book *Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students*. It stated that Values Clarification made students "aware of their own feelings, their own ideas, their own beliefs…their own value systems (1993:80). Kilpatrick also provided several examples of the types of questions that were taken from the Values Clarification handbook (a half a million copy best-seller):

> "Tell where you stand on the topic of masturbation"; "How important are engagement rings to you?" "Tell how you feel and what you actually do about alcohol or pot"; "Talk about your allowance—how much you get, when and how, and whether you think it's fair." (1993:18)

The values clarification (or AVE) program had its supporters. Much of the support resulted from the fact that it no longer followed a lecture format but rather was more interactive. Groh quotes one historian from Craig AFB as saying, "This program is much better received than Moral Leadership was in the past, due to the group-centered and non-pedagogical nature of Values Clarification" (1986:612).

Groh describes the chaplain's involvement in the ML or AVE programs as a skill ministry. He states that, "during the Seventies the major emphasis in this area fell upon the chaplain as facilitator or catalyst who, because of special competence and skill, could help persons clarify and evaluate the values they perceived as important" (1986:616). This is a totally different skill than had been previously used when they were recognized and utilized as the subject matter experts concerning human morals and character education.

The use of AVE and values clarification continued into the Eighties. Groh stated:

> Air Force Regulation 50-31, Moral Leadership, mandated AVE. The program emphasized the need for persons to pursue ethical decision-making that was appropriate to their current and anticipated environments. The basic requirement for AVE in the first year of service in 1986 was four hours in basic training, four hours in technical training, four hours in officer training, and three hours in flying-navigator training. (1991:395)

An AVE chaplain training workshop was held in 1986 which resulted in "revised AVE program goals [which] more adequately addresses and integrated the relationship between individual and institutional goals" (Groh, 1991:395).

Many of the same topics that are addressed today were also AVE subjects in 1988. Several examples of these subjects include "authority versus integrity, ethical implications of current issues, true and false reporting, accountability and moral courage, and conflicting loyalties" (Groh, 1991:395). An AVE evaluation conference was held by the

ATC Command Chaplain in 1988 which "revised the program goals and guide" (Groh, 1991:395). As a reminder, during this time period ATC was the only command mandated to provide this type of training since the change was made in 1966 that only required personnel in particular schools to receive this training.

As a result of the conference a successive chaplain workshop was held. Based on these two events, "A proposed revision of AFR 50-31 aimed at helping personnel in their moral development and ethical decision-making rather than values clarification, which had been the main focus throughout the decade" (Groh, 1991:395). According to Groh, this revision allowed chaplains to help "trainees assess their value systems in an atmosphere of sharing and open discussion. The process challenged the young adults to make decisions about values that would create a more productive lifestyle" (Groh, 1991:395). This change in direction in 1988 allowed the chaplains to again be able to encourage healthy and appropriate values rather than just facilitating discussion so that others could realize what their values were, healthy or unhealthy.

When discussing the AVE program, Groh effectively links the previous historical initiatives that have been conducted that relate to the AVE program. He states, "Its antecedents included the Character Guidance Program (1948), Dynamics of Moral Leadership Program (1957), and the Moral Leadership Program (1961)" (1986:611).

As can also be inferred from a message from HQ AETC to the different AETC Quality detachments, values education had existed prior to this initiative. Specifically, Adult Values Education had been previously conducted by the chaplains per paragraph A of Appendix F. It states, "For technical training wings, Core Values replaces Adult Value Education currently being conducted (AETC message, August 1993).

Many criticisms concerning values clarification were found throughout the literature review. The unsuccessfulness of the initiative was also a frequent statement that was heard throughout the interview process. The following section provides some of these criticisms.

Criticisms of Values Clarification. Unlike the preceding character development initiatives, much has been written concerning the criticisms of values clarification, in both government and in the private world. It is the intent of this section to identify these criticisms. According to Rehberg in his unpublished paper titled, *Ethics and Character Development in Government Organizations*, Values Clarification was designed in the 1960s by Louis E. Raths and Sidney B. Simon (August 1994:20). Rehberg cites multiple sources which describe the underlying criticisms of this model. These claims include the argument that the Values Clarification process has no coherent theory of morality upon which to base its educational recommendations; that Values Clarification is subjectivism in the classroom; and that its methodology is inconsistent with the methods of inquiry and teaching that are proper to the academic disciplines (1994:20). Rehberg also provides a quote from William Bennett which states,

> According to the "values clarification" program, schools were not to take part in their time-honored task of transmitting sound moral values; rather, they were to allow the child to clarify his/her own values. (The Devaluing of America, 1992)

Kilpatrick also has much to say concerning the shortcomings of values clarification and its related programs. He states:

> In brief, students are being taught by the wrong method—a method that looks more and more like a fad that won't go away. Ironically, the method, which made its appearance in the 1960's, not only fails to

> encourage virtuous behavior, it seems to actively undermine it, leaving children morally confused and adrift. (1993:15)

He later argues the absurdity of the rationale that people do not need training in order to be good. As an illustration he says, "None of us want to go to untrained doctors, or fly with untrained pilots, or have untrained soldiers protect our country, but for some reason we have come to believe that one can be a good person without any training in goodness" We have succumbed to a myth that claims that morality comes naturally, or at most, with the help of a little reasoning (1993:25).

Kilpatrick believes that the shift from character education to techniques such as values clarification:

> was begun with the best of intentions. The new approach was meant to help students to think more independently and critically about values. Proponents claimed that a young person would be more committed to self-discovered values than to ones that were simply handed down by adults. (1993:16)

According to Kilpatrick this hope was not achieved. Kilpatrick discusses how our society started with character education then switched towards the values clarification approach and is now coming back towards character development once again. He states:

> Character education was what took place in school and society in the past. It was sometimes heavy-handed and always liable to abuse, but it seemed to serve our culture well over a long period of time. It has been criticized as being indoctrinative, but in some crucial respects it may have made possible more real freedom of choice than we now possess. It has been dismissed as naive, but new evidence suggests that it is more psychologically sophisticated than the methods that replaced it. There are signs it is now making a comeback. (1993:16)

According to discussions with several chaplains, this type of process is very similar to what took place in the Air Force. As individuals of different faiths or no faith made objections in the 1960s to not be required to attend these types of lectures, Air Force

leadership decided to modify the program to one where people would be able to "realize" their own values, rather being lectured to and told what values to hold. Without exception, all of the individuals who were questioned about "values clarification" believed that it was ineffective and generally a waste of time.

As mentioned just prior to the previous section on criticisms of values clarification, Adult Values Education was replaced by Core Values. The following section discusses the 1993 Core Values initiative.

The 1993 Core Values Program

This effort is the immediate "father" of the Air Force's current Core Values initiative. General Fogleman confirmed this when he responded to an author's claim, and stated in an editorial in the *Air Force Times:*

> …I have not launched a "core values crusade" to "vector the Air Force back to the path of professional conduct" as stated in the Air Force Times article.
>
> We are continuing along a path that the Air Force started down in 1992, when our service leaders identified six core values for the service as part of our quality initiative. (March 17, 1997:37)

The six Core Values espoused under General McPeak's program were integrity, competence, courage, tenacity, patriotism, and service. Definitions of each value provided in the *Foundations For Quality: Air Force Core Values—Personal Application Handbook* (Appendix C) include:

> Integrity: "An unfaltering devotion to honesty, truthfulness, doing one's duty, and doing what is right." Integrity includes keeping commitments, being sincere, being honest in word and deed and expecting the same of others, accepting the responsibility for one's action and being a morally upright person.

> Competence: "The quality of possessing the skill, knowledge, and experience to perform a task." Competence includes knowing how to do the job, doing your best and ensuring that subordinates are trained and equipped to do their jobs.
>
> Courage: "A willingness to face difficulty, danger, and pain while knowing the risks and still being able to do what is right." Courage includes assertiveness, decisiveness, initiative, positive attitude and living one's convictions.
>
> Tenacity: "The quality of holding a firm resolve. Tenacity is that value which causes us to hold to the chosen course despite challenges or difficulties, to see a thing through."
>
> Patriotism: "Love of and devotion to one's country." Patriotism includes respecting the values of American culture and heritage and supporting and defending the US Constitution.
>
> Service: "The giving of self to provide for the welfare of others. In the Air Force, the focus of our service is the defense of our nation." Service includes concern for the welfare of others and willingness to act on that concern, willingness to act in cooperation with others to accomplish common goals and determination to meet our responsibilities regardless of consequence. (*Foundations For Quality: Air Force Core Values Personal Application Handbook*, 1993:2-5)

The planning for a Core Values Program under General McPeak began in August 1992. A memorandum from the Vice Commander of Air Education and Training Command (AETC/CV), dated 30 July 1993, provides good insight into this initiative. Highlights of the first three paragraphs and the beginning of the fourth paragraph are provided below. For a complete copy of the memo see Appendix D.

This memo provides insight and confirms testimony obtained from Air Force Academy personnel as to why the initiative was created and how it was to be implemented. Several points need to be made here. The first has to do with the genesis of the initiative itself: why was it started? Several individuals had stated in the interviews that the initiative started as a result of the quality movement. During that time period it

was the "vogue" thing to do, as many corporations were also developing "core values" within their companies. By the time the Core Values pamphlet was published, the Air Force had been involved in the quality movement for several years. Air Force adoption of the Total Quality Management (TQM) philosophy dates back to at least late 1987, where commands such as Air Force Logistics Command and Air Force Systems Command had already began their implementation of quality. It seems reasonable that after several years of implementing TQM that quality terminology would be prevalent among senior Air Force leadership. Several statements within the memo seem to support this. Paragraphs one and three both contain the phrase "quality Air Force." The fourth paragraph also lists the office of primary responsibility as the Quality Improvement (QI) office.

Even stronger support is provided in a memorandum from AETC/QI to all AETC Quality Coordinators, dated 18 August 1993 (Appendix E*)*. In describing how the AETC Quality Coordinators are involved the memo states, "Our tie-in is the 'values and principles' which is a direct result of AF Quality Council work." The memo goes on in a later paragraph to explain, "And this is where QI fits. Since values and principles are the foundation of this program, and QI is the vehicle by which values and principles got to the 'front burner' we have become the experts—by default. We must step up to the challenge and be the experts and champions" (AETC/QI Memo, 18 August 1993).

This seems to make sense, but it does not fully answer the 'why' question? It also does not explain who was responsible for this initiative prior to the quality office, since they apparently were doing the best they could to "come up to speed" on what the effort was all about. In the author's search for any specific information concerning the one or more events that may have led to the programs implementation, very little official

documentation could be obtained. There were speculations and rumors concerning certain events that transpired that may have been enough to "break the camels back", so to speak, but these were certainly not the official explanation provided by senior leadership. An unofficial reason why the initiative was created includes the paraphrased statement that, "it was a great opportunity for the Air Force, in the same time period as the Tailhook incident, to create an initiative that was both preemptive and corrective in nature." This apparent claim was essentially that the Core Values Program allowed the Air Force to "clean up its house," while at the same time remain in a positive light. This was the case since the Air Force was perceived as going the extra mile to ensure values were emphasized, even though their record was clean and they were not accused of any wrong doing.

One such rumor as to why the training responsibility was in the process of shifting from the chaplains to the quality office was that the Chief of Staff had unexpectedly walked into the room where chaplains were conducting values training. Upon entering, the Chief overheard what he considered to be inappropriate spiritual teaching being given by the chaplains. As a result, the chief changed the organization responsible for implementation to the quality office. The primary explanation concerning the Core Values Program is found in the *Foundations For Quality: Air Force Core Values* pamphlet, also referred to as the *Personal Application Handbook*. This pamphlet is the equivalent of the Air Force's current pamphlet or *Little Blue Book*. This portion of the pamphlet provided below is from the introductory remarks of the pamphlet and it draws a link between several important quality concepts:

> When we talk about what the United States Air Force is all about, three concepts—vision, mission, and core values—are separately linked. Our vision defines the quality of service for which we strive. Our mission tells us the purpose for which we serve. Our core values are those critical attitudes and behaviors upon which the accomplishment of our vision and mission rest. Put another way, core values are the bedrock foundation upon which a truly quality Air Force is built.
>
> The purpose of this workbook is to define those core values and provide you with a framework for applying them in the performance of your duties. We hope you will use it to work through a process of thinking about and developing a plan for more effectively living core values as a member of the United States Air Force. (*Foundations For Quality: Air Force Core Values*, 1)

As stated above, the core values are necessary in order to successfully accomplish the vision and mission. The contents of this pamphlet are discussed in further detail later in this chapter.

Another direct reference to the "why" question was found in *the United States Air Force Academy Professional Development Program Study Guide*. It first references the following quote by General Glover, "A man of character in peace is a man of courage in war. Character is a habit. The daily choice of right and wrong. It is a moral quality which grows to maturity in peace and is not suddenly developed in war" (1993:Block 3-1, 2). The Study Guide then directly addresses the issue by stating, "Why do we have Core Values? Because the Air Force must have officers and leaders with integrity and sound moral character. We cannot accept less. We owe this to those we lead, to those who lead us, and the country we serve" (1993:Block 3-2). This statement appears to be directly interested in developing strong character in its people. Interestingly, the study guide goes on to address its own Academy Core Values immediately following this section of the Air Force Core Values. The Academy's three Core Values during that time period (Integrity

First, Service Before Self, and Excellence in All We Do) were the genesis for our current Air Force's Core Values.

The second point that needs to be made concerns who is responsible for providing the actual training. Paragraph three of the AETC/CV memo answers this question by emphasizing "…commander involvement and participation at all levels. Commanders should present/lead all areas, of instruction when feasible, drawing on local expertise as necessary…." (AETC/CV Memo, 30 July 1993). Why is this important? Is this not the way it always has been? Is it possible that the Air Force did not really emphasize the subject of values in terms of having a program or initiative prior to the quality movement and more specifically General McPeak's six Core Values? These questions can be better addressed by further excerpts from the memorandum from AETC/QI to all AETC Quality Coordinators, dated 18 August 1993 (*Appendix E)*. Based upon the tone of the memo, it was written early in the life of the Core Values Program when apparently many questions were still unanswered. Also, even though the memo concluded with the statements, "Finally, this letter is not policy. It is simply an attempt to shed a little light on a somewhat confusing issue." It does do just that.

The first light that it sheds concerns the previous question addressed above of who was responsible for delivering the Core Values message for this program? According to the third paragraph of the memo,

> From the very beginning, the program has been emphasized as a 'commander's program. This means commander-level participation, visibility, and backing. Not to be delegated to the Chaplain, social action, or the Exec, the commander is expected to have the lead role—in front of the troops, leading the discussion, taking the questions. I heard it put this way: We need a clearer and more deliberate passage of core values and principles directly from our leaders to our members. In other words,

> leaders communicate what is important to us directly, through mentoring, example, and interaction. We are trying to get away from learning them exclusively from books and lectures in ROTC, BMT, etc. An analogy is the powerful way children learn their values (good and bad) from their parents, provided parents spend enough time with their kids *communicating* values. Enough sermon." (AETC/QI memo to all AETC Quality Coordinators, dated 18 August 1993)

The above statement is consistent with the frequent comments made in the telephone interviews saying that the Air Force leadership wanted a more direct line from the respective commander to his/her "troops." A more direct line than what, one might ask, and how is this different from how the Air Force conducted values training prior to this? Paragraph five of this same memo provides additional guidance on who is to implement the training. It states, "Not to leave the commanders out alone on a limb, 'additional key resources' are identified for help in preparing and getting smart. They are the Chaplains, Social Actions, PME Instructors, and other instructors" (AETC/QI memo to all AETC Quality Coordinators, dated 18 August 1993).

Appendix F is a message from HQ AETC to many of the key Quality Improvement (QI) organizations throughout the United States concerning the subject of Core Values. It was sent to these organizations to provide additional clarification and guidance on the implementation of the Core Values within these organizations. It is provided as Appendix F. This message addresses the questions above and states,

> "For technical training wings, Core Values replaces Adult Value Education currently being conducted. Your installation's chaplain's office was provided advance notice of the change by AETC/HC, and we encourage use of this expert resource in the conduct of the Core Values Program. (AETC message, August 1993)

The chaplain's role was apparently dramatically changed in the early nineties. The implementation of values training was no longer delegated to them, but rather additional

emphasis was placed on the responsibility of each respective commander. Nevertheless, written documentation still allowed, and even encouraged, chaplain involvement in a "supporting" role. A memorandum from HQ ATC/HC to ATC chaplains, dated 5 August 1993 concerning the Core Values Program (CVP) supports this claim. Relevant portions from this memo ***(***Appendix G***)*** are provided below:

> 1. Important changes are being made to values education in Air Education and Training Command. I support these changes wholeheartedly. They will bring about increased commander involvement and support of values education. Core values will become the commander's program, not the chaplain's. The time spent by chaplains in actual classroom values education instruction may be reduced, but the role of the chaplain will not. In fact, this new approach to values education demands an increase in the level of professionalism with which the chaplain approaches values education.
>
> 2. The CVP will emphasize the importance of Air Force core values to maintaining a quality Air Force. In it commanders and their designated representatives will have the responsibility to explain *what* core values are and *why* they are important. Chaplains will focus on the *how* dimension, helping students relate core values to more universal values, their own personal values, and a sense of personal mission. They will also, as in the past, help students to think and implement principles of sound ethical decision making. A copy of the CVP instruction sequence model is attached to help you visualize the relationship between the commander and chaplain involvement.
>
> 3. A central resource in the new core values program is a pamphlet entitled *Foundations for Quality: Air Force Core Values*. (Memo, Core Values Program (CVP), dated 5 August 1993)

In the remaining four paragraphs of this memo, there are additional statements made concerning the role that is left to the chaplain. The chaplains are encouraged to "aggressively involve themselves" in the program as "chaplain function involvement is critical to its success." They are asked, however, to not mention or get too involved with the program until the commander takes the lead and announces the importance of the program (Memo, Core Values Program (CVP), dated 5 August 1993).

Based on this memo, the chaplain's responsibilities were significantly changed in relation to what had previously been delegated to them. The changes included less direct instructional time but a continued involvement with the program. The chaplain was still responsible for the "how dimension", and the commanders had the responsibility to discuss the "what" and "why" dimensions. This "how" dimension appears to have been significant, as its delineated responsibilities appear to be many based upon the remainder of paragraph two above.

What is interesting about this is the apparent conflict concerning the first assumption of the current Core Values initiative. It states, "The Core Values Strategy exists independently of and does not compete with Chapel programs" (*The United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet*). What appears to have happened in this case is that the previous Core Values Program relieved the chaplains from their responsibility to conduct Adult Values Education. Even though McPeak's Core Values Program was designed to maintain the involvement of the chaplain, the actual involvement was reduced from what it had been previously. This has the effect of a net loss in terms of the chaplain's responsibilities and opportunities to get in front of an organization's personnel and address issues related to values. Although the chaplain's office had supported the increased involvement of the commanders, they were given the understanding that they still had a major role to play as well. What ended up happening is that this role also diminished.

Through interviews with the personnel referenced as the experts in the above mentioned Appendices, a greater insight was obtained. When asked why the initiative was created, the 'official' response was that General McPeak had stated that developing Core Values was a natural step in maturing of the QAF, or Quality Air Force. General McPeak

believed that the development of the organization's Core Values should be done in conjunction with the development of an organization's vision, mission, and strategic planning. According to Lieutenant Colonel Ed Billman, who was a member of the Air Force Quality Council Working Group at AETC in 1993 when this initiative began, General McPeak requested suggestions from many organizations concerning appropriate Core Values. Many organizations such as the Chief of Chaplain's Office, the Academy, and ROTC already had Core Values in place for their respective organizations. Unfortunately, most of the respective Core Values were different between the organizations. Not only were the words and values themselves different, but also each of the associated training curriculums. General McPeak desired to have the entire Air Force teaching the same thing concerning values, and so the initiative began.

When questioned about the role of the chaplain, the responses were very much in alignment with the memos referenced above. The respondents agreed that the intent was to have the chaplain remain as an integral part of the 1993 initiative but *not* as critical as the emphasis that the commander would have as leader and initiator of the values training. The respondents stated that prior to the 1993 initiative, the whole issue of values had migrated to the chaplains since many commanders had inadvertently "over delegated" their responsibilities. None of the respondents accused the chaplains of overstepping their bounds or faulted them for not adequately accomplishing any previous training.

According to Lieutenant Colonel Billman, the 1993 Core Values Program sought to re-emphasize the commander's responsibility, and in a sense, it was "upping the presence of leadership, since it [values] is so important."

According to the interviews, the structure of the Core Values Program was very informal. Lieutenant Colonel Billman stated that the intent of the Core Values Program was to have commanders take a bigger role in discussing the subject of values with their subordinates in different "natural environments." Natural environments were simply non-forced pre-existing opportunities where commanders could naturally bring up the subject of values. Examples included such things as feedback and mentoring opportunities. Lieutenant Colonel Billman suggested that to develop a "program" or "checklist" approach might be counterproductive. He provided the illustration that we as parents do not (or at least should not) just set aside a certain time or two to lecture our children on our value system. It is an ongoing process in which we ought to take many opportunities to share our values with our children. This could be done while we are fishing, eating, or just playing in the backyard. We would probably never just tell our kids once or twice how they should act or what they should believe but rather do it continuously throughout their life. In the same way we ought not to just give one values lecture and consider the job done. Nevertheless, as a whole, this is unfortunately what may have occurred. Lieutenant Colonel Billman stated that he thought the initiative did not fully meet its potential because we "took an intellectual and almost spiritual subject, and made it a training effort."

Commanders would frequently call requesting guidance on how to implement the training. According to Lieutenant Colonel Billman, AETC was specifically directed not to give guidance, and if they wanted to all they could really give would be their own opinion. For example, they could provide the different opportunities mentioned above that could occur naturally. Eventually the chaplain's office developed four lessons that could be used

by organizations for training. These, however, were not intended to be all inclusive. Many organizations eventually took all four briefings and quickly conducted each of them. Lieutenant Colonel Billman stated that this produced a "clash between intent and practical execution." This phenomenon was not overly surprising, however, since people tend to gravitate towards programs and checklists. By quickly accomplishing these briefings, many commanders felt as if they had "checked the box" and therefore had one less thing to do on their list. In the end, Lieutenant Colonel Billman stated that although the briefings were given, word from the field suggested that many commanders did not take the time to sit down with and teach these values to their subordinates, as was the original design. In the end, one source close to the initiative described how the initiative just "fizzled." He speculated that this occurred since the effort never truly became institutionalized because no one was being asked about the progress of the initiatives or held accountable to report such results.

In addition to the previous memorandums that have been referenced, there were two documents created that were used as the primary source of training and guidance. They were the *Foundations For Quality: Air Force Core Values—Personal Application Handbook*, and an AETC Instructor Guide-IG, entitled *Core Values*. The highlights of these documents are discussed below.

Foundations For Quality: Air Force Core Values—Personal Application Handbook

This pamphlet was developed by the Chaplain's office at AETC and served several purposes. Its purposes was:

> to define those core values and provide you with a framework for applying them in the performance of your duties. We hope you will use it to work through a process of thinking about and developing a plan for more

> effectively living core values as a member of the United States Air Force. (*Foundations For Quality: Air Force Core Values*, 1)

The Personal Application Handbook includes the reprinted words that are stated in the Enlistment Oath, the Commissioning Oath, the Preamble to the Constitution, and a portion of the Declaration of Independence. The Bill of Rights is also part of the document but the pamphlet was designed with this document in the background and therefore only a couple of the lines can actually be read. One cannot help but notice that three of the first four documents make a reference to either God or the Creator. Both the Enlistment and Commissioning Oaths end with the voluntary phrase, "So help me God" and the portion of the Declaration of Independence that is provided states: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness."

The Personal Application Handbook lists the United States Air Force Vision, the Air Education and Training Command Role, and the United States Air Force Mission. Next the handbook defines and briefly discusses each of the six core values. A summary and challenge are given after each of the six values was discussed. It states:

> The core values are essential to mission accomplishment and living out the Air Force vision. The Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General Merrill A. McPeak, has said: "Being the world's most respected air and space force is more than a vision. It is a way of life . . . a commitment to our profession's core values." Every member of the Air Force must commit to live core values and influence others to live them. This is a must if we are to be a truly quality Air Force. (*Foundations For Quality: Air Force Core Values*, 6)

The next major section is titled, "Personal Application—Living Core Values." This section looks at two characteristics of people that have been successful in using the Air

Force core values along with their own personal values to guide them in this complex and often confusing world. These two characteristics of these type of people are that they are proactive, and they have a sense of personal mission. A checklist of three questions was provided in an attempt to help make good proactive decisions. These questions include: Is it legal? Is it fair? and Will it make me feel good about myself? Concerning the second characteristic, the handbook provides a six step procedure to develop a personal mission statement that was adopted from the "Personal Mission Statement" process, (Covey Leadership Center). These six steps include: outline your personal vision; select a positive role model; identify what roles you play in the Air Force; draft a personal Air Force Mission Statement; evaluate and reevaluate; write a permanent draft.

The handbook then provides a test to help Air Force personnel "gauge how important core values are to you. It will also give you some ideas on how to more effectively implement them in your life" (*Foundations For Quality: Air Force Core Values:* 18). The handbook as well as material that was taught at Squadron Officers School concerning Officership Values in August 1994 both state the following:

> Much study has been done on the subject of values and their power to influence behavior. One result of this study is a clear understanding that a key to the power of any value in our lives is a personal acceptance of its importance and a commitment to live it based on that acceptance. In other words, a value must be deeply believed in his or her life. Values cannot be imposed.
>
> This is an important principle to remember as we talk about valuing core values. The Air Force cannot impose the core values on you—it can't make you value them. (19; 1994:1104-R-3, 4)

A list of examples are then provided to help us realize when we truly value a particular value. The handbook states, "A value becomes a value in our lives when we:"

exercise free choice, choose from alternatives, consider the consequences, prize it, affirm it, act on it, and repeat it (18-19).

The handbook concludes with the following two paragraphs. Here the overall tone of trying to make a difference in the values of Air Force personnel, while at the same time in such a way that is more suggestive than directive. It concludes by stating:

> Core Values are not just nice ideas to which we give lip service. They are foundational principles upon which a truly quality Air Force is built. The challenge to each of us is to gain a personal understanding of what the core values are and how to more effectively live them out as members of the Air Force. This booklet was developed to help you in that process. It is up to you to make the suggestions given in this book more than just words on a page. We encourage you to take time to seriously think about what has been presented here, discuss it with your friends and associates, and work through the exercises which will help you to develop a personal mission statement.
>
> The Air Force is flying into a very exciting future. It will be characterized by higher and higher levels of quality as each of us continually improve our ability and determination to live the core values. (*Foundations For Quality: Air Force Core Values*, 20).

Another indication of this Program's suggestiveness rather than being extremely directive is found on the first page where it states, "We hope you will use it to work through the process of thinking about and developing a plan for more effectively living core values as a member of the united States Air Force" (1).

AETC Instructor Guide-IG, Core Values

Appendix D includes a cover letter and a copy of the AETC Instructor Guide-IG, (July 1993). The cover letter states that this guide "provides guidance for local development of lesson plans for instruction to all trainees as well as permanent party personnel" (30 July 1993 memo from AETC/CV on the subject of Core Values Training Program). The guide provides four suggested lessons and additional guidance for a

number of related areas. A Core Values Instruction Sequence Model was part of the guide and was used to summarize these areas. These additional areas included the training target population, lesson designation, lesson timing, commander involvement, additional key resources, and resource role. Specific guidance was given for each of these last four categories.

A brief summary of the four lessons and their associated learning aids were discussed in the first several paragraphs of the guide, under the heading, "Special Instructions." It stated:

> Lesson 1 could be taught in one sitting, since the lesson is primarily used to give out information. Lesson 2 is aimed at incorporating core values into a personal mission statement and should include small group discussions. Lesson 3 is concerned with personal decision making and should include small group discussions. Lesson 4 is aimed at integrating Core Values into the individual's personal values.
>
> The operational concept calls for Lessons 1 and 2 to be taught in Basic Military Training and all precommissioning sources. Lesson 1 will be taught in existing base "Intro" courses and as a one time presentation to all permanent party. Lessons 3 and 4 will be incorporated into existing base level Technical Training and Undergraduate Flying/Space training courses, and lower level PME.
>
> The instructional design is primarily lecture for Lesson 1, with small group discussion opportunities and individual exercises in Lessons 2-4. Lessons 1-3 should normally be taught by flight commander equivalent or above. Lesson 4 should normally be taught by chaplains.
>
> Instructional media consists of several documents, to include the US Constitution, DOD Human Goals Charter, Oaths of Office, Joint Publication 1, and HQ AETC/HC (Chaplains) Handout, "Foundations For Quality."

One interesting observation is that although the training implementation guidance came from an " instructor guide," there are several statements that are more of a requirement than mere guidance. For example, the AETC Instructor Guide states:

> The instructor guide (IG) is an outline of instruction. Academic instructors will personalize this IG and develop their lesson plan. The IG contains objectives to teach, lesson sequence, instructional aids required, and other guidance to prepare and conduct training. It also includes the recommended sequence of instruction within each lesson. Academic instructors may adjust only the sequence of instruction within each lesson. Any other deviation from the IG, such as deleting instructional aids, adjusting overall lesson sequence, or changing the course length, require the approval of the 419th Operations Training Squadron.…(July 1993).

One section of the guide, entitled "To the Instructor," provides additional insight into how the initiative was intended to operate.

> This program provides training for all members of AETC and students on the Core Values of the Air Force. The plan progresses through: definitional aspects and the origin of core values and the importance of core values to the individual. The scope of the training includes the human relations, sexual harassment and equal opportunity climates.
>
> As the instructor, you should stress the course is designed to maximize student input. The instructors' role in this course is primarily to set the tone of the discussion and act as a facilitator after the commander presents the heart of the material defining and discussing the importance of core values. In order to derive the maximum benefit from this course, students are required to actively participate in discussions, listening effectively and seriously participating in any scenario presentation.
>
> Ensure all students know they will be required to take the core values with them and practice them in their daily lives as Air Force members (1993:i).

The remainder of the guide contains the outlines of the four respective lessons. Each lesson includes its goal, instructional aids, suggested method, instructions, and related information. The last three lessons all refer to the use of the AETC/HC Handout *Foundations for Quality*, as the primary instructional aid for each lesson. In the back of the lesson package, there is a list of eight Core Values Training Objectives. Two of the eight objectives focus on learning outcomes of the training. They state that the Air Force members should:

- Know how Core Values are derived from the basic principles upon which the United States was founded, and
- Know the relationships between Core Values and the oaths of commissioning and enlistment.

These are provided as an indication as to what the Core Values initiative under General McPeak taught concerning the basis or foundation of the Core Values.

Additional Information

Chaplain Alexander B. Roberts, who at the time was a Lieutenant Colonel in the Air Force, was the primary author of the handbook, *Foundations for Quality: Air Force Core Values.* According to others interviewed he was also a strong proponent for keeping the chaplains involved with the Core Values initiative. Chaplain Roberts also authored an article in *Airpower Journal* entitled, "Core Values in a Quality Air Force: The Leadership Challenge," while this initiative was underway that can provide additional insight into his perspective concerning this subject.

Addressing the issue that the six values identified in the initiative are not the only enduring values, he states, "Some would argue that the list has significant omissions. The one most often pointed out to me is faith. Perhaps that is because I am a chaplain. Omissions aside, the list is a core list, not a comprehensive one" (1994:42).

Chaplain Roberts also emphasizes that quality people are critical and the character of individuals is paramount. In explaining why living the Core Values is essential to a quality Air Force, He states that

> The human dimension is vital. The aspect of that dimension critical to success in battle is character—the strength of one's continuing commitment to live professed values. The words of German general Guenther Blumentritt make that point well:

Knowledge is important: efficiency even more so. But character and personality are the most important. Knowledge can easily fail and can, in fact, be the cause of failure. Not intelligence but character is the unfailing factor. Only character is reliable in tough situations, and…in combat.

In a sense the character of the institution of the Air Force rises and falls on the commitment of each individual member to live its core values.

Von Clausewitz, in his discussion of "military genius" in *On War*, argues powerfully for the importance of character. Commenting on the "fog" of war, he points to the uncertainty of "three quarters of the factors on which action in war are based." He then makes the case that the one way out of this "relentless struggle with the unforeseen" is the capacity to retain "some glimmerings of the inner light which leads to truth; and second, the courage to follow this faint light wherever it may lead." That is character. He then goes on to flesh out the concept of character by pointing out that it is the quality of sticking to one's convictions and keeping one's balance in the face of "exceptional stress and violent emotion." Character to Von Clausewitz is not just having "powerful feelings" but resides in having an understanding of and faith in "the overriding truth of tested principles."

Real faith leads to action. Faith is not just professing belief. James, in the New Testament, said that "faith without works is dead." Although he was speaking of a different level of faith, the principle applies in this context. Faith is manifest in our actions, in living what we say we believe. When people live out their faith in those tested principles that we call core values, the trust between all team members essential to effective mission accomplishment cannot help but be positively impacted. It is important to point out that this truth applies not only to combat but to all aspects of the operation of the Air Force. A constant theme of the Air Force today is the notion that enduring quality will only flow out of an "institutional culture" characterized by trust. It logically flows that the promotion of continuous improvement in the character component of quality will lead to higher levels of trust and higher levels of quality. As the organization more closely aligns individual action and organizational strategy, structure, style, and systems around core values, more "latent creativity and energy" will be unleashed to create "benefits that go straight to the bottom line."

In a sense, core values represent fundamental doctrine about what works in combat. In addition, they also represent what one author has referred to as "true north" principles. They point to what works to bring about quality in organizations in a more general sense. (1994:44-45)

Chaplain Roberts included a section concerning Core Values training. His thoughts relating to how the training ought to be accomplished were very similar to those espoused by Lieutenant Colonel Billman previously. He stated:

> Training in core values at all levels is essential, but the program must not become a forum for lecturing, moralizing, or preaching. It should be designed to teach the critical thinking skills needed to deal with the hard issues and emphasize that proactivity based on core values is a must in the Air Force. It is best accomplished in an environment which encourages participant interaction and discussion leader involvement. It should focus on case studies that deal with real world issues for participants. (1994:50)

Concerning the subject of providing an environment that is compatible with the core values, Roberts stated: "In line with the principle that values are both 'caught' and 'taught,' a concerted effort must be made to ensure that institutional policies and practices at all levels fall in line with core values" (1994:51).

Summary

This chapter identified the previous Air Force values-related initiatives since the Air Force was created in 1947. This included the Character Guidance Program, the Dynamics of Moral Leadership Program, the Moral Leadership Program, Adult Values Education, which for awhile was also referred to as values clarification, and lastly the Core Values Program.

A significant portion of the chapter discusses the previous Core Values Program and its related details. Where appropriate relevant attributes were highlighted for later analysis in Chapters VII.

Chapter 6

Initiatives at The United States Air Force Academy

Chapter Overview

This chapter addresses Air Force Academy programs and related policy documents. The majority of these initiatives fall within the control of the Academy's recently created Center for Character Development. Special attention was provided concerning the Academy's emphasis on character development, and the importance of the spiritual dimension was noted in their efforts to inculcate values into character. The subject of historical mandatory chapel attendance is also addressed.

The United States Air Force Academy

The United States Air Force Academy is arguably one of the best examples of an institution of higher education that is concerned with developing individual character as indicated by the CEP. Not only that, but in many ways the Academy could be looked upon as the model for the rest of the Air Force. While discussing the Academy's character development program, Lt. Gen. Bradley C. Hosmer, who was then the Superintendent of the Academy, stated, "We then set out to develop methods to make the Academy a model for character development for the entire Air Force" (1994:7). Another example of this

from a volume of the Air Force Chaplains' history, as it particularly relates to chaplains, is provided below. According to Scharlemann:

> by design and definition, the Academy is the institution that was created with the expectation that it would produce the core of the Air Force's professional leadership. For that reason, the Chaplain personnel and program at the Academy were to be models for an operationally effective chaplaincy throughout the Air Force. (1971:212)

Before the individual programs and divisions are discussed. it is important to note that the Air Force Academy also emphasizes a total program of individual development. In the case of the Academy, they have what they refer to as the four pillars. According to Lieutenant Colonel Bill Wallisch, in his article, "Four Pillars of Excellence," the success of the Academy goes far beyond the academic curriculum, Colonel Wallisch states, "Our Superintendent, Lt. Gen. Winfield W. Scott, Jr., put it best when he said that our program rests on four strong pillars: military, academic, athletic, and spiritual" (1984:97). Colonel Wallisch continued:

> The core curriculum, of course, falls under the Dean of the Faculty. The superb military training is the responsibility of the Commandant of Cadets. The Director of Athletics, of course, sees to it that cadets have the sound bodies they need not only to meet the rigors of our program but also to prepare themselves for future demands. The spiritual aspect can be found in every area and is perhaps the extra dimension that traditional learning might have overlooked in recent years. (1984:97)

The importance of this spiritual aspect shows up in many of the Academy's historical documents. According to Andrus, "Faith and continuing spiritual growth are crucial in cadet life. The Cadet Chapel, a building of striking beauty that inspires awe and reverence, provides a constant reminder of the centrality of religious faith in the life of the total person" (1979:9).

In the forward to Chaplain Zielinski's article, additional insight into the religious program at the Academy up through the late 1950's is provided. It states:

> The Academy considers religion an important part of the life of the Cadet. Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jewish services are held weekly. Attendance is compulsory until the final six months of Cadet life. Before each meal of the day at the Academy, Cadets pause together for a silent prayer. (1959:91)

Zielinski argues that regardless of our scientific advances, "Without strength of character man drifts aimlessly without a rudder" (1959:91). Zielinski then proceeds to explain the importance of religion on values:

> Religion plays an indispensable role. It gives man an anchor. It imparts essential purpose to life itself. It gives meaning to the challenges of sacrifice in the name of duty and honor by relating them to the unchanging values inherent in man's relationship with and responsibility to his Creator.
>
> It is for these cogent reasons that the space age cannot afford to be less godly than the ages that preceded it. Divine and human values remain the same.
>
> Just how practical a role religion plays in character formation is readily discernible at a military academy. Religion deals with values that are inner convictions of conscience. Once they are properly internalized, they stand on their own two feet and become a code of conduct quite apart from need for external supervision.
>
> Why religion in a space age? The answer is evident. Man differs in a space age not one whit from man in any other age. His need for sound, moral values remains constant. His needs for self-discipline becomes even greater. His need to live up to higher ideals becomes intensified. It is religion that undergirds these ideals, moral values, and stability of character, giving purpose to his life. To probe the vast expanse of the universe that once tumbled from the hands of the Creator is not man's most important task. That task is to live in the likeness of Him in whose image man was made.
>
> Knowledge of this eternal truth underlies our religious program at the Academy. (1959:92)

Not only has the Academy historically emphasized the importance of character, but it also has emphasized the importance of religion in developing these values and character. The next several sections provide some additional insight into the Academy's position not only on character but also the importance of spiritual development when developing character in its cadets.

The Air Force Academy's Center for Character Development

According to the Character Education Partnership (CEP):

> In August of 1993, the Academy created a Center for Character Development after two major studies concluded that (a) poor character in members of the cadet corps was a common factor in many of the significant problems confronting the Academy, and (b) the Academy's efforts to develop good character must become more effective for the Academy to achieve its essential mission of training future Air Force officers and leaders. (1996:18)

As mentioned above, the Center is comprised of three divisions, two of which are discussed: the Honor and Honor Education Division, and the Character Development and Ethics Division.

The USAF Academy's Honor and Honor Education Division. This is the division responsible for enforcement of the Honor Code. According to a pamphlet entitled, *Honor Code Reference Handbook of the Air Force Cadet Wing*, the Academy's Honor Code is, "We will not lie, steal, or cheat, nor tolerate among us anyone who does." On the inside cover of this pamphlet, the full code is again restated. The previous statement continues with the extra words added to the end of the code, "Furthermore, I resolve to do my duty and to live honorably, so help me God" (1996:inside cover). This statement was added in December 1984 when "the Cadet Wing voted to accept a new honor system which included this additional statement to the oath.…The addition of this statement to the code

was to help cadets realize the importance and close relationship between honor and duty" (1996:2). The pamphlet states that this additional statement "reflects the acceptance of a personal commitment to excellence in *all* aspects of military service based upon a strong foundation of duty and 'Integrity First'" (1996:2).

The pamphlet provides the following history of the Code:

> In September 1956 the class of 1959 adopted this Code as a minimum standard for all Air Force Academy cadets. As the guardians, or stewards of this Honor Code, each successive class, has administered, interpreted, and cultivated the Code. It is the Cadet Wing's duty to ensure the Honor Code never becomes stagnant. Every cadet must take responsibility for the vitality and effectiveness of the Honor Code.
>
> The first Superintendent, Lieutenant General Hubert R. Harmon, believed that an honor code would be an essential element of the new Academy and had commissioned a study group a year earlier to examine the honor codes and systems at other military institutions. The "founding fathers" of the Air Force Academy clearly recognized the need for a code of ethical behavior which would contribute to the overall Academy mission: to develop exceptional officers. An honor code was needed which would inspire cadets to live honorably and thus graduate with the highest standards of individual integrity. (1996:2)

The *Honor Code Reference Handbook of the Air Force Cadet Wing* also speaks of the role a code plays in developing character. It states:

> Honor codes, concepts, and a variety of educational tools have been at the heart of service academies since their inception. They have historically been the cornerstone to make character central to the development of tomorrow's military leaders. Codes or concepts define a minimum standard of ethical conduct. A code is not an end in itself, but rather a means to help develop strong and honorable character. Codes should **not** be feared, but rather used as a cornerstone to help develop one's character.
>
> The military codes set the service academies apart from almost every other college because of their high ethical standards and the strong focus on character development. A code (or concept) reminds us that: 1) There is a right and a wrong in most cases; 2) As future officers we have the responsibility to make moral judgments; 3) Just because there is diversity among different societies and cultures does not mean right and wrong are unknowable and; 4) Codes help prevent us from falling down the slippery

> slope of ethical relativism (anything goes) that have been detrimental in developing character and counter to the professional military ethic. (1996:3)

The majority of the remainder of the pamphlet defines and describes the Honor Code violations and provides several appendices for reference. The following two paragraphs are taken from the pamphlet's Summary:

> This is our Honor Code and we are extremely proud of it. We are all equals when it comes to honor. The Honor Code sets a standard in four discrete areas: honesty, respect, fairness and support. The four don'ts in the Code provide the minimum standard while the six positive principles provide the ideals that will help us live by the spirit of the Code— "Do the right thing and live honorably." Living honorably is what we call integrity, which is a moral wholeness or "walking the talk." Integrity is essential to all considerations of ethics. Moral courage is an important aspect of integrity that requires us to do what is right even when it is likely to cost us more than we want or think is fair. It may require us to stand up for our beliefs and demonstrate the courage of our convictions.
>
> Living up to the spirit of the Honor Code, or living honorably, is a life-long aspiration and a life-time process. The truly honorable cadet will not hide behind our Code, nor will cadets try to live by these base minimums. Character development more than just the Honor Code; it also includes the Air Force and Academy Core Values, Academy Character Development Outcomes, human relations, ethics, and moral and spiritual development. Every cadet must understand and respect the Honor Code highly if it is to remain the cornerstone of cadet life. Your four years here at the Academy will provide you with a foundation and an opportunity for your character development; the development that you will build on throughout your career and lifetime. **The Academy experience is designed to make character central to tomorrow's Air Force leaders**. (1996:21)

According to the Honor Code Handbook, the six positive principles that are outlined in the Honor Oath are honesty, respect, fairness, support, duty and living honorably (1996:5). The handbook refers to these six as principles, as opposed to the other "Four Don't," which are referred to as precepts. The four don't that are referred to in the Honor Code include don't lie, don't steal, don't cheat, and don't tolerate. The handbook states that these precepts flow from principles (1996:5).

The final bolded statement above sends a strong message as to how important the Academy views character development. The use of such statements as "…designed to make character central" explicitly sends a message of the particular importance concerning this aspect.

The CEP report provides further insight by stating:

> …The Academy's decision to expand greatly its character development efforts is a recognition that the Honor Code alone was insufficient to achieve the Academy's strategic goal of "Produc[ing] who have the knowledge, character, and motivation essential to leadership, pride in all they do, and commitment to an Air Force career.(1996:18)

Although this is true, it is also an indicator of the Academy's commitment to producing excellent officers of the highest character.

The CEP report also states that the Academy has recently made some changes to even place greater emphasis on the importance of character development. The report states:

> Character development is the core of the Academy experience. Therefore instructors and staff members must promote a climate of positive moral growth, honor, and equitable human relations so as to encourage ethical conduct among cadets and the Air Force community. (1996:19)

Among four other things identified, the new instruction states that Academy personnel should consider the spiritual dimensions of character development(1996:19).

These statements may be the strongest yet in terms of the importance of character development. Here the Academy has stated that character development is important, but it "is the core of the Academy experience." We also find mention of how Academy personnel need to consider the spiritual dimensions when making an effort to develop character amongst the cadets.

The following section provides some of the details concerning the Air Force Academy's recent efforts of building character.

The USAF Academy's Character Development and Ethics Division. The Center for Character Development created a Character Development Manual in May 1994. The manual provides the United States Air Force vision, the Mission of the Air Force Academy, the Strategic Product Goal, and lastly the core values of the Academy: integrity first, service before self, and excellence in all we do. These values would later become the entire Air Force's core values and not just the Academy's. The Strategic Product Goal identified was to, "Produce officers who have the knowledge, character, and motivation essential to leadership, pride in all they do, and commitment to an Air Force career." This document leaves little room for the imagination as to the intent of the Center for Character Development.

The manual identifies eight desired Character Development Outcomes. The following rationale is provided in the manual for these outcomes:

> The following statements of desired "outcomes" are offered to all Academy pmission elements for the following purposes:
>
> First, and most important, they state our aspirations. They reflect our ideals—what we hope that every cadet and member of the Academy community strives to do and to be.
>
> Second, they elaborate the core values of the institution. They serve, therefore as the basis for institutional and self education…the touchstone and framework to which we return when we ask why we do what we do and modify what we do in our quest for excellence. Further, they provide a shared language within which we critique ourselves and each other.
>
> Third, they provide a framework for assessment of all we do as an institution. We must assess our activities to determine whether we succeed in doing what we say we strive to do. Nevertheless, it is equally important to recognize that all assessment efforts are imprecise and must always be placed in the context of the somewhat less precise, but ultimately more important, statements of our highest ideals. (1994:4)

The eight Character Development Outcomes are provided in Table 7. The first three outcomes are the direct representation of our Air Force Core Values.

Table 7. Eight Character Development Outcomes

Officers with forthright integrity who voluntarily decide the right thing to do and do it.
Officers who are selfless in service to their country, the Air Force and their subordinates.
Officers who are committed to excellence in the performance of their personal and professional responsibilities.
Officers who respect the dignity of all human beings.
Officers who are decisive, even facing high risk.
Officers who take full responsibility for their decisions.
Officers with the self-discipline, stamina, and courage to do their duty well under even the most extreme and prolonged conditions of national defense.
Officers who understand the significance of spiritual values and beliefs to their own character development and that of the community.

The remaining five outcomes encompass additional values that the Core Values do not directly address. Through the interviews with personnel from the Center for Character Development it was revealed that personnel involved with the Core Values initiative had requested that the outcomes be limited to the first three so as to be in alignment with the Core Values. Personnel at the Center for Character Development, however, decided against this request due to the limitations this would have on their ability to measure their success towards these outcomes and communicate what their aspirations were. Members of the Center were concerned that the three Core Values were not sufficient to fully measure their success. Several metrics are being used to track these eight outcomes.

The last of the eight outcomes, which emphasizes the significance of spiritual values and beliefs toward character development is discussed in the following section. The manual states:

> Officers with this understanding are clear in their own convictions and respect the convictions of others. They understand that the leadership role

> requires sensitive awareness of the role that religion plays in peoples' lives and their need to accommodate and support individuals' freedom to exercise faith. (1994:6)

The following section provides a discussion of the contents of a pamphlet developed in support of this eighth outcome. It provides strong support of the importance that the Academy has and continues to place on the spiritual dimension when involved in an effort to develop character.

Design for Spiritual Development (1994). This pamphlet was created in the form of a strategic plan to achieve this eighth Character Development Outcome. By definition of being an outcome, spiritual development is recognized as an important factor in character development. The document discusses the chaplain's mission in terms of a "a blend of our mandate [assuring the nonnegotiable freedom of every individual to exercise faith] and the educational role of the Academy" (1). The pamphlet says, "The chaplain activities mission is to provide for and support spiritual and character development through the free exercise of religion and pastoral care" (1).

The pamphlet also states that, "The founders of the Academy clearly recognize the significance of a healthy spiritual life in the formation of balanced officers" (2). The pamphlet discusses the Center's focus in such a way as to be very cautious concerning either over or under emphasizing religion. For example, the pamphlet states:

> The Air Force Academy affirmed the Center's emphasis of the importance of spirituality to cadet character development in its institutional outcomes, but the Center's focus is not and should not be religious. Character education must strike a careful compromise between eliminating religion and teaching faith. It needs to be recognized that character education should never be seen as a replacement for religion or as an instrument of religion, but should teach respect for different religious traditions. (2)

Also, because of the "concerns associated with the 'separation of church and state,' appropriately require the character development agenda to be written in secular language" (2, 3).

The cautious tone quickly changes to one of strong support, recognizing the importance of spiritual development in the context of overall character development. The following argument is provided below:

> A primary assumption of theology is that human beings are spiritual creatures. Therefore, spiritual development is an essential and foundational ingredient of human growth. In fact, theologians would say that human fulfillment **requires** our coming to terms with who we are as spiritual persons.
>
> This design for spiritual development uses the assumptions of theology as a backdrop which helps cadets understand their nature and the spiritual resources they own in faith.
>
> Thus, it is the premise of the religious community that human beings find their ultimate fulfillment in relationship with God. The premise is that God created us in his own image—a spiritual image. To find fulfillment as a human being, then, is to come to terms with our spiritual self. Our **spiritual development** is a process of discovering who we are as God's created ones and engaging in an intentional struggle for an understanding of what this requires of us as we live our lives.
>
> The nature of our relationship with God becomes the filter through which every other aspect of our lives is perceived. It is possible to choose to ignore our spirituality. That is a choice each person must make. However, our decisions, our relationships, our vocational choices, our vision for the future and our perception of the present are all defined by our understandings of our spiritual self and our relationship with God. If this premise is true, we cannot fully develop as human beings if we diminish or ignore the truth of our spirituality. It is the foundation to our very nature and destiny as human beings. It is at the heart at the way we think and act. (3)

It is important to keep in mind that these statements are all in support of one of the eight desired character development outcomes. Based on the premises that are made above, the Academy believes that the development of character would be stunted if we

deny our spirituality. Another way of saying this is that the Academy believes we cannot fully develop character without addressing the spiritual dimension. This finding will be important when comparing the emphasis that other initiatives place on the importance of the spiritual dimension when trying to inculcate values.

The pamphlet provides the details of their four respective designs: The Jewish design; the Christian Design; the Islamic Design; and, the Buddhist Design. Recent statistics concerning cadets upon arrival at the Academy also shows that the vast majority describes themselves as having a spiritual background. The pamphlet states that, "Approximately 94% describe themselves as Christian, either Catholic or Protestant, Jewish and Muslim cadets comprise about 1% each. The remaining 4% responded with either No Religious Preference, Buddhist, Agnostic or Atheist" (5). If some perceive that the foundation of values is in fact religious in nature, and character development is being sought without any emphasis on the spiritual dimension, these statistics beg the possibility that a large percentage of the population could potentially be alienated, or minimally frustrated, by the lack of spiritual basis provided. This is particularly true since the 1993 Core Values Program includes both the enlistment and commissioning oaths which both end with "So help me God" as provided in the *Foundations For Quality: Air Force Core Values—Personal Application Handbook* on the inside cover of the pamphlet.

Another historical illustration of how important the Air Force Academy has viewed the spiritual dimension in building character is found in their earlier policies concerning mandatory chapel.

Other Academy Curriculum on Character

The Academy has always placed great importance on teaching the subject of character. This section provides several excerpts from The United States Air Force Academy Professional Development Program, the *Second Class Cadet Study Guide*, during the Fall Semester 1993. The guide had been developed and was being taught in 1993, around the same time the Center was being created. Two of the twelve chapters in this study guide are dedicated to character development and ethics. This section identifies several of the highlights from these chapters. A quote referenced in the guide that was made by Gen. Matthew Ridgeway, a Korean War hero, indicates the importance that the Academy places on the subject of character. It states:

> Character is the bedrock on which the whole edifice of leadership rests. It is the prime element for which every profession, every corporation, every industry searches. It is the prime element for which they search in evaluating members of their organizations. With it, the full worth of an individual can be developed. Without it [character], particularly in the military profession, failure in peace, disaster in war or, at best, mediocrity in both results. (1993:Block 5-1)

The Academy has stated time and time again how important character is. Colonel Alexander developed a point paper entitled "Character Development Program," dated 5 April 1994, which states "Linking up with the national character education movement has been valuable both to the Academy and to other organizations." He then lists the agencies that have sought out the Air Force Academy's assistance. At that time these agencies included: the US Justice Department, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, the SAF General Council, the CSAF General Council, Naval Academy, AU Commandant/Provost, ROTC, SOS, and OTS.

The Academy also taught a model on the ethical decision-making process. The model depicts that as ethical problems arise, several forces are at work that influence decisions being made. These same forces that influence ethical decisions, also influence character. According to the United States Air Force Academy Professional Development Program they include laws, orders, and regulations, basic national values, traditional Air Force values, spiritual, unit operating values, your values, institutional pressures, and a world view (1993:Block 6-5). The spiritual force received the largest explanation of any of these forces. In explaining this force, the guide states:

> The significance of spiritual influences and values in shaping moral and ethical precepts appeared early in American History when the writers of the Declaration of Independence affirmed that "all men are created equal" and are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights. . . ." Prominent in the shaping of fundamental moral values in our society has been the influence of the Judeo-Christian heritage. This rich and diverse heritage affirms in many ways that human beings are moral persons responsible for their own decisions and behavior and that they are obliged to concern themselves about the well-being of other persons and to respect living creatures and the physical environment. (1993:Block 6-5)

Historical Mandatory Chapel

The importance of the spiritual dimension to the Academy is apparent from its religious program, and more specifically its mandatory chapel policy. The following excerpts are from the Annual Report of the Superintendent from two different years, 1966 and 1970. These sample years capture the thoughts of the Superintendent of the Academy just prior to the decision by the courts that mandatory chapel was unconstitutional. In 1966, the report stated:

> It has been proven, based on long experience of history, that a vital religious experience is essential for men who assume the crucial responsibility of the defense of the nation, where not only men's lives, but the welfare and preservation of the Nation and the nations of the world are

> at stake. The vision, the resources, and the motivation of religious faith are essential to the quality of leadership that is demanded of officers.
>
> From its founding the Air Force Academy has followed the policy of having every cadet attend Sunday Chapel. In the case of first Classmen, they are encouraged to attend either chapel or religious services of their chosen faith. The religious policy is twofold: first to make it possible for a cadet to develop his personal religious experience; and second, to acquaint the cadet with religious responsibilities inherent in the Air Force. Once he has been sworn in as a cadet he accepts and participates in this well-rounded program of leadership development. The compulsory element is common to every aspect of this training in leadership—military, academic, and spiritual. All of it is considered so essential that none is left to the discretion of the cadet. (1966:39)

These are strong statements that go beyond just the need for Air Force Academy cadets to receive this religious experience, but rather for all men who will take on this responsibility of defending the nation. The statement says that all officers need this religious experience in order to provide the quality leadership demanded of them. The spiritual aspect was put on the same compulsory level as the other aspects of military and academic training.

The 1970 report also provided strong support for its religious program. The report stated:

> An important objective of the Academy religious program is the development of moral and ethical sensitivities that emerge from critical reflection of these values, without which a man is less prepared to distinguish those important values.
>
> Mandatory attendance at scheduled Chapel Services is considered an essential part of cadet training. (1970:51)

This same report mentioned the initial events of what would eventually lead to the discontinuation of the mandatory chapel program. It stated:

> Early in 1969 the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) sought an injunction against the mandatory chapel attendance policies of the United States Military Academy and Annapolis which are similar to those of the

> Air Force Academy. At an early stage of the proceedings, the ACLU applied for a temporary restraining order against punishment of cadets and midshipmen refusing to attend chapel pending the outcome of the case. The District Court Judge denied the restraining order but was reversed on appeal by a three-judge panel. Air Force Academy policy remains unchanged pending the outcome of the case. On 31 July 1970 the U.S. District Court rendered a decision in favor of the Defendant, DOD. It is expected that the ACLU will take the case to the Appellate Court for review. (1970:52)

Referring to the decade of the Sixties, Scharlemanns' statement in the chaplain historical documents also confirmed these reports, "Compulsory chapel attendance at all service academies became a major issue during the closing years of the decade" (1971:214). The issue that Scharlemann is referring to is whether or not to continue the policy of mandatory chapel.

The United States Military Academy's (West Point) Annual Report of the Superintendent also provides some important historical documentation concerning this time period. It is even more telling in a sense that a brief longitudinal review can be made for a number of years over the time period from 1969 to 1974. As some of the following years provide repetitive information from the previous year, only portions that are considered new and relevant are provided for each year. For the year covering July 1969 to June 1970, the report stated the following on the subject of religion:

> Attendance at chapel remains a part of a cadet's training in character development, and no cadet is exempt. Each cadet must attend either the Cadet Chapel, Catholic Chapel or Jewish Chapel service each Sunday according to announced schedules. He may also attend special denominational services in addition to his regular chapel service. There are many voluntary activities in which a cadet may participate, including morning worship service, evening religious discussion groups, chapel choirs, acolyte squads, weekend religious retreats, and the West Point Sunday School staff. All of these activities contribute significantly to the development of character in the Corps of Cadets. (1970:32)

This statement makes it real clear that religious training was felt to be very important in the character development of cadets. Another interesting observation is that during this time frame the Academy only had accommodations for Christian and Jewish worship services. This is understandable, however, as this captured the vast majority of the population during this time.

The following year, 1971, the report stated:

> The United States Military Academy accepts responsibility for the total development of cadets—mental, physical, military, and moral. Training essential to development in each of these areas is therefore scheduled on a compulsory basis. Since 1821 compulsory chapel attendance has been a vehicle for the presentation of training essential to the moral development of our cadets. The basis for such training stems from the vast responsibility that a commissioned officer must assume to the men under his command. He must be prepared not only to lead them in battle, but among a myriad of other responsibilities, to understand their religious background and, on occasion, render appropriate spiritual guidance. (1971:37)

These statements confirm previous statements provided in the historical reports of the Air Force Academy. Moral development, as opposed to what the Air Force Academy refers to as spiritual, was a compulsory element along with mental, physical, and military development. Not only was chapel attendance compulsory, but it had been since 1821. The West Point report also gives the same rationale for the importance of this moral development. Again, the argument is implicitly made that all officers, not just West Point graduates, will incur great responsibilities to lead men and therefore need this development. These officers were expected to understand different religious backgrounds so that he could provide spiritual guidance when needed.

This particular annual report also discussed the court challenges that were taking place during this time and some of the changes that were being implemented at West Point

as a result. This report also discussed that for the first time a change had been made concerning mandatory attendance. Under certain situations cadets could be excused from attendance. It was interesting to observe, however, that during this time period, even if a cadet received permission from the Superintendent to be excused due to his personal convictions, he was still required to attend a discussion where religious background and beliefs were taught. This was done so that the cadet would understand these beliefs and the soldiers' respective needs once the cadet became an officer and was responsible to lead men.

The following year, 1972, the report stated:

> On 30 June 1972 the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia circuit reversed the District court's decision to uphold compulsory chapel. This case was remanded to the District Court for the entry of an appropriate order. No such order has been issued, and USMA, with authority of the Department of Defense, will continue compulsory chapel until further notice. Meanwhile, USMA is studying tentative solutions in the event that a permanent injunction is served. (1972:37)

It is interesting to observe that even after the United States Court of Appeals reversed the District court's previous decision to uphold compulsory chapel, the United States Military Academy did not immediately end the mandatory policy until an appropriate order was issued. It appears from the above citation that the Military Academy continued studying possible solutions "if," or as the citation says, "in the event," that a permanent injunction was served. There is no indication based on these statements that the Military Academy in any way agreed with this ruling that reversed the previous decision which allowed mandatory chapel to continue. The Military Academy appeared to merely be preparing for the necessary changes should the ruling not go their way.

The following year, 1973, the report stated that the Supreme Court ruled that mandatory chapel was unconstitutional:

> …However, as a result of a Supreme Court decision announced in December 1972, the chapel program at the Military Academy was required to be made voluntary in nature. Even though the chapel program is now voluntary, the Academy's responsibility for the moral development of cadets, remains the same. Its methods of fulfilling the religious needs of cadets have been adjusted, as appropriate, to comply with the court ruling. Specifically, the Academy's new program has been designed to be a positive one, one in keeping with the spirit of the Court's decision and not just its letter. As such, cadet religious activities, to include attendance at chapel services as well as participation by cadets as choir members, ushers, acolytes, and Sunday School teachers, now are entirely voluntary. (1973:37)

This annual report continued by stating:

> In further discharging its obligation for the religious, moral and ethical training of cadets, the Academy is stressing intellectual stimulation of cadets rather than formal training. A primary means of accomplishing this intellectual stimulation has been active discussions between cadets and chaplains as well as guest speakers.
>
> The task of encouraging cadets to participate in voluntary religious activities has been left largely to the Academy's chaplains and to cadets and officers who take an active interest in religious activities. Additionally, cadet commanders are expected to play a positive role in encouraging cadets to participate in religious activities and to set the example by their own participation. (1973:38)

Even after the December 1972 final ruling which went against the Military Academy's policy of mandatory chapel attendance and made the chapel program voluntary in nature, the Academy continued to stress that their responsibility for the moral development of cadets, remained the same. They just had to go about it by a different means. Some could well argue that mandatory chapel was not the best policy or approach to encourage cadets to be involved with, learn about and appreciate religious beliefs. What would be a much harder, perhaps impossible, argument to make is that the Academies never saw the

importance of religion in the development of their cadets, for this truth is well documented.

Interestingly, in the following year, 1974, the report has no discussion of its religion program at all (1974). No reports for the following years were reviewed.

As can be seen, over just this five year period, a rapid change was taking place. As can also be seen, the Academies were not the initiators of the change nor did they seem too interested or in agreement that the change would be beneficial to their overall program to build character into their cadets.

According to Andrus:

> When the courts did away with compulsory religious services, there were visions of the famous landmark chapel becoming a mausoleum. Church attendance, after a temporary decline, has recovered a substantial part of the Cadet Wing. Beyond that, the services, being voluntary, have a higher degree of cadet participation and sheer joyfulnes[s] than was ever the case when cadets were marched to church. (1979:22)

Summary

This chapter provides additional supporting material concerning several of the current organizations, and on-going initiatives and policies at the United States Air Force Academy. Information is also provided concerning historical initiatives at the Academy. The importance of developing character is so paramount at the Academy that it has developed its own Center for Character Development. The Center is composed of three divisions which share the responsibility of inculcating character into the academy's cadets. Two of the three divisions were addressed in this chapter: USAFA Honor and Honor Education Division and USAFA Character Development and Ethics Division. Additional citations from the cadets coursework were also provided. Lastly, discussion concerning

the Academy's position on the importance of spiritual development when trying to inculcate values and character was provided. As an example of this historical importance that the Academy has placed on spirituality is the importance of mandatory chapel. A brief synopsis of the last several years of this policy was provided. The Air Force Academy then, represents a viable starting point for the evolution of the current Core Values initiative into a continuing character development program. Not only did the current Core Values emanate at the Academy, but also the Academy clearly represents a leader model in the training and development of character. How the efforts of the Air Force Academy are appropriate and will be utilized within the rest of the Air Force deserves the discussion of our leaders.

Chapter 7

Analysis and Findings

Chapter Overview

This chapter briefly addresses each of the four research questions based he data previously identified and discussed. It summarizes the key similarities and differences found in answering research question three and recommends areas requiring further clarification based upon these differences.

Special attention was placed on the amount the initiatives emphasized the importance of character development and the role of the chaplain over time. Table 8 provides a summary of this analysis.

Research Question 1

What initiative directly preceded the current Air Force Core Values initiative?

The current initiative was directly preceded by the 1993 Core Values Program. General Fogleman also recognized this genesis in his editorial in the *Air Force Times* on Core Values. The Core Values Program was initiated under General McPeak the then Chief of Staff, USAF, as part of his quality initiative. This Program had six core values, several of which are similar to our three values espoused in the current Air Force initiative.

No documentation was identified that indicated its termination and it was confirmed through the interviews that such documentation probably does not exist.

Its continuing success command wide was only marginal at best. A general indication of this was the feedback from many of the interviewed sources and the additional personnel who were contacted while the research effort was on-going who were not aware that such an initiative ever existed. Another indication that the program was not communicated very well was indicated by the difficulty the author had in finding anyone who had or even knew of where documentation concerning the initiative could be obtained.

One source close to the Core Values Program described how the program just "fizzled." It was speculated that this occurred since the effort never truly became institutionalized because no one was asked about the program's progress or were held accountable to report such results. This research effort may very well contain the most available documentation on the 1993 Program.

Research Question 2

What other Air Force initiatives/programs/efforts related to values and character development have been conducted? These initiatives could include any previous Air Force effort that is focused on such issues as character, morals, values, and ethics as opposed to dealing with improving intelligence, skills, knowledge or competency.

Four other historical initiatives, in addition to the 1993 Core Values Program, were identified through this research that have ties to the current Core Values initiative and are therefore relevant to this discussion. These initiatives included the 1948 Character Guidance Program, the 1957 Dynamics of Moral Leadership Program, the 1961 Moral Leadership Program, the 1974 Adult Values Education (AVE) Program, which also

included a period where "Values Clarification" was taught. As referenced above, these initiatives were identified through chaplain historical documentation, as the chaplains were primary players in these programs.

A brief summary of each initiative is provided in Chapter V of this study. One of the most interesting and surprising observations that was made was that a clear lineage was found to exist between these values-related initiatives since the creation of the Air Force. In every case, the chaplain historical data neatly tied each preceding program to the next. No overlap was identified to exist between these initiatives. When one ended, the next one immediately replaced it. This was generally unknown to the many experts who were knowledgeable on the respective initiative that they were involved with, but had little to no experience concerning the other initiatives. Additional findings concerning these historical initiatives are referenced throughout the remaining discussion.

Research Question 3

How are these initiatives similar to and different from the current Air Force Core Values initiative?

McPeak's Core Values Program has several similarities and also a number of significant differences to that of the Air Force's current Core Values initiative.

Table 8 provides a summary of the various initiatives based upon the selected attributes.

Similarities

The similarities included both had senior Air Force leadership support; senior leadership identified what the specific core values themselves were in both initiatives; both

developed a “Blue Book” equivalent which was distributed Air Force wide as a guide to the respective values that Air Force members must adhere to; both had a similar strategy as to how the values training should be conducted throughout the Air Force; and, both initiatives applied to all Air Force personnel. So from a top-down perspective, both initiatives followed a similar development and implementation plan. Concerning the strategy as to how the values training should be conducted throughout the Air Force, both taught that commanders should utilize “natural environments” or opportunities to remind or open up discussion concerning the Core Values. Examples of such opportunities include during briefings, performance appraisals and through mentoring.

Differences

While minor differences can be seen from Table 8, the more important differences include the role of the chaplain, the emphasis on character development versus fixing organizations first, the amount of spiritual emphasis, the tone of the associated pamphlet and supporting material, and the basis or foundation upon which the values are founded.

Table 8. Summary of Key Differences Between the Initiatives

Attribute	1997 Core Values Initiative	1993 Core Values Initiative	Other Air Force Values-Related Initiatives	Air Force Academy Initiatives
Intent of Initiative	To identify the price of admission to the Air Force; to point to what is universal and unchanging in the profession of arms; to help us get a fix on the ethical climate of the organization; to serve as beacons vectoring us back to the path of professional conduct; the Core Values allow us to transform a climate of corrosion into a climate of ethical commitment. First task is to fix organizations	To provide a framework for individuals to apply core values to performance of their duties. To develop officers and leaders with integrity and sound moral character	Character Guidance and Moral Leadership training of officers and enlisted personnel.	"Helping make character central to the development of tomorrow's military leaders"
Role of the Commander	Ultimately responsible for the success of the initiatives (Commanders responsible to personally brief their immediate subordinates. This cannot be delegated)	Ultimately responsible for the success of the initiatives (Commander responsible to identify the "whats" and "whys" of the initiative)	Ultimately responsible for the success of the initiatives (Typically commanders delegated responsibility down to the chaplains)	Ultimately responsible for the success of the initiatives

Table 8—Continued

Attribute	1997 Core Values Initiative	1993 Core Values Initiative	Other Air Force Values-Related Initiatives	Air Force Academy Initiatives
Role of the Chaplain	Advisor to the Commander (Does not compete with chapel programs. Chaplains involved in their own programs, no specific role in this initiative)	Advisor to the Commander (Chaplains responsible to teach and explain the how's of the initiative)	Advisor to the Commander on matters of religion, morals, and morale (Primary participant)	Advisor to the Commander (An active member in these initiatives. Other members include representatives from academics, athletics, and military training)
Audience	All Air Force Personnel (including civilians and contractors)	All Air Force Personnel (including civilians and contractors)	Mixed Across Initiatives Mostly, officers and enlisted personnel	Air Force Academy Cadets
Centralized or Decentralized	Decentralized, with several exceptions	The Most Decentralized	Mostly Centralized	Centralized
Communication Media	Web Access	Traditional	Traditional	Traditional
Authors of Pamphlet and Supporting Material (Process Owners)	AETC & Air Force Academy Philosophy Department	AETC/HC (Chaplain Office) AETC/QI (Quality Office)	Chaplains, specifically AFPCH	Chaplains, also working with individuals concerned with military training and academics
Amount of Supporting Material	Substantial	Limited	Unknown	Substantial

Table 8—Continued

Types of Supporting Material and Rationale in Pamphlet	Quotes	Quotes Enlistment Oath Commissioning Oath United States Air Force Vision The AETC Role Declaration of Independence Preamble to the Constitution	Brochures and Lectures	Quotes Honor Oath Commissioning Oath United State Air Force Vision Mission of the Academy Pamphlets on Academy's Curriculum and Honor System
Emphasis on Character Development	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Emphasis on Fixing Organizations	Yes	No	No	No
Spiritual Emphasis	Very Little	Indirect but more than 1997 Core Values Initiative	Relatively High	Very High
Tone of Associated Pamphlet and Supporting Material	Directive	Suggestive	Unknown	Directive
Basis	Emphasis on Functional with Little Ethical	Functional and Ethical	Functional and Ethical	Functional and Ethical
Supporting Role/Advisor to the Commander on Initiative	"Gurus"—Individuals from any Specialty—Mainly Quality and Personnel Backgrounds	Chaplains, Social Action Officers, Quality Office Personnel	Chaplain	Chaplains among others
Number of Values	3	6	Not Applicable	3

It is important to remind the reader that of the sixteen attributes that were identified in Chapter II, most of the findings will focus on the emphasis that each initiative places on character development, the role of the chaplain across each initiative, the emphasis that is placed on the spiritual dimension in efforts where character development is being sought, and the basis that is provided for the respective values. In an effort to address each of the attributes, the following analysis will only provide a top level assessment. The attributes relating to the emphasis on character development and the role of the chaplain are the subject of research question number four.

Stated Intent/Purpose of the Initiative. As identified above in Table 8, the focus of each initiative is very different. The focus on the 1997 initiative is, to identify the price of admission to the Air Force; to point to what is universal and unchanging in the profession of arms; to help us get a fix on the ethical climate of the organization; to serve as beacons vectoring us back to the path of professional conduct; the Core Values allow us to transform a climate of corrosion into a climate of ethical commitment. Under the eighth assumption the pamphlet also states that "our first task is to fix organizations."

The 1993 Program's focus was on helping individuals perform their duties and as the Squadron Officer School training teaches, "To develop officers and leaders with integrity and sound moral character." Other previous initiatives also focused most of their attention on providing character guidance and moral teachings to the troops. As a matter of fact, no other Air Force initiative was found that placed its emphasis on the organization; they have always been centered on people.

Role of the Commander and Chaplain. Another interesting and somewhat misunderstood finding that this research uncovered was related to the role of the

commander. Some of the people interviewed as well as some of the documentation read suggested that the responsibility of the respective initiatives went back and forth from the commander to the chaplain. This is "technically" not the case. It is true that in several of the initiatives, the chaplain was the primary resource both developing and presenting the material of the respective initiative, where in other more recent initiatives the commander's involvement has been emphasized more as critical. Where this understanding is wrong is some individuals misunderstand the fact that the commander had always been ultimately responsible for such initiatives. He or she had merely delegated responsibility to the chaplain to assist in morals, character, and values education. As early as 1948, the Air Force defined the function of the chaplain as follows: "A chaplain in the Air Force is primarily a minister of religion, and as such is the advisor to the commanding officer on all matters pertaining to the religious life, morals, and character building factors within a given command" (Jorgensen, 1961:62). Jorgensen made it clear that Air Force Regulation 165-3 stated the ultimate responsibility rested with the commanders. What has happened over time is that this role has in many cases been over or under delegated. Even in the 1993 Core Values Program the chaplain was intended to play an integral part in explaining the "hows," where the commander was responsible for providing the "Whats" and "whys." Nevertheless, the 1993 program did bring a reduction to the chaplains' overall involvement. This involvement was totally replaced in the current Air Force initiative by the gurus.

Audience. The early Air Force initiatives were directed to all Air Force military personnel. There was no mention of whether these initiatives applied to government employed civilians. Even up to the 1957 Dynamics of Moral Leadership Program all

enlisted and all officers through the rank of lieutenant colonel were required to attend these lectures. Amongst growing opposition in the 1960s, changes were made that only required those in basic training, technical school, officer candidate school and WAF instruction to continue taking this type of training.

The two most recent Air Force initiatives have changed this policy to require all Air Force personnel to participate in training. However, no training for the civilians in the 1993 program could be identified. The most recent initiative even explicitly states that the Core Values also applies to civilians and contractors. Unfortunately, no other information relating to either group is addressed below that statement.

Future research could be conducted in this area to determine who the appropriate audience is that ought to be targeted. Based on several of the quotations provided in this study, it appears that minimally all officers and other leaders who will have the responsibility of leading men and women need to have strong moral character. This is certainly emphasized at the Air force Academy.

Centralized or Decentralized. This attribute relates to the degree to which personnel under a particular initiative must follow a standard set of procedures or report to a respective office concerning how well the initiative has been implemented or perhaps show data that ensures compliance with a respective policy. An example of this is where organizations check attendance numbers to ensure everyone has received the information.

Earlier initiatives were more centralized in that they had a particular point of contact, the chaplain, who developed all of the respective training that would be provided and could provide follow-on assistance where requested. Many of these initiatives also required mandatory attendance where numbers were kept and tracked. The Academy is

the most centralized in that it requires its students to adhere to a specific code. A structure is in place to enforce this code when incidents occur that require it. This includes related disciplinary actions.

The previous two initiatives are more decentralized that the earlier initiatives. The 1993 Program is especially decentralized, some would argue to the point that it "fizzled" due to lack of an accountability and structure upon which to report successful progress that had been made. The 1997 initiative also leaves the implementation strategy up to each respective commander, although it uses much firmer language when explaining the possible deviations, or lack thereof, that can be made in this initiative.

The assessment that the current initiative is relatively decentralized is consistent and in alignment with the strategy to have all commanders develop their own plan. The primary two individuals currently working the current initiative and training all of the gurus across each command do not have time to be the expert for every organization. This is certainly not to imply that they cannot be of assistance to those with questions, as they do the best they can given a time constraint.

Communication Media. Each of the initiatives used traditional means, such as pamphlets, brochures and briefings to communicate necessary information. The major difference here is that the latest Core Values initiative has access to a resource that the previous initiatives did not, the Internet. The current initiative has a web site that anyone with access to the Internet can review. It is hoped that through this resource, interested individuals can be kept better informed as to any changes that may take place. Additionally, the Internet and availability of electronic mail (E-mail) offers tremendous opportunity for facilitational discussion on the Core Values initiative.

Authors of Supporting Materials. This attribute shows a clear difference between all previous values-related initiatives and the most current Core Values initiative. In each initiative, excluding the most recent, the chaplain had been responsible for developing the supporting documentation for the training that was provided. This included both developing lectures and developing the pamphlet that would be distributed. This includes the 1993 Core Values Program.

The current Air Force Core Values initiative departed from this history. Individuals from the United States Air Force Academy's Philosophy Department and from Air Education and Training Command were responsible for gathering the thoughts from senior leadership and developing the *United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet* that we use today.

What is significant about this is that depending upon the perspective of the authors of the supporting materials, an entirely different "slant" can be placed on the document. For example, the chaplains are probably more likely to incorporate more references to "spiritual aspects" within such a document than other authors would. In this case, the emphasis on the spiritual aspect is almost non-existent in the current initiative. This emphasis appears to run counter to what the Academy does in its internal programs. Additionally, based upon several interviews at the Academy, others preferred more spiritual emphasis.

Amount of Supporting Material. This attribute is perhaps less important since the relationship does not necessarily exist that more is better. It does, however, provide an indicator of how well the initiative has been communicated or explained. The current initiative provides a great deal more information than can be found concerning the 1993

program or any other previous Air Force initiative since the creation of the Air Force. It is possible that during the earlier times, when the other initiatives were being conducted, that a large amount of supporting material was available concerning each respective initiative but if that is true it is no longer easily obtainable. Even documentation on the recent 1993 initiative under General McPeak was extremely hard to obtain. Even after talking with the Chief of Staff's office, history offices, and many other individuals, no data was found. Eventually, a lead from a chaplain led the author to contact an Air Force Reserve chaplain who had previous experience with the program. The data discussed in this study concerning the 1993 program came primarily from his personal files.

The current initiative has a well developed architecture and very thorough *Guru's Guide* to help the identified assistants to the commander. The *United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet* also contains some very explicit guidance concerning what is expected of Air Force personnel and why we have such a program.

The Air Force Academy also has a substantial amount material concerning its programs, curriculum and codes.

Types of Supporting Material and Rationale in Pamphlet. Another aspect of the supporting documentation is its content and the different types of supporting material and rationale provided in the documentation. Although each of the initiatives provide supporting quotations and the definitions of key terms, the similarities essentially end there. The documentation from the Academy's Center for Character Development and the 1993 Core Values Program continue to follow a very similar format. Both include references to related documents such as commissioning oaths, the United States Air Force Vision and mission of each respective organization. Both documents tie the subject of

core values to the vision and mission of an organization. According to the *Foundations For Quality: Air Force Core Values* pamphlet, "core values are the bedrock foundation upon which a truly quality Air Force is built" (1). The *Foundations For Quality: Air Force Core Values* pamphlet also contains references to additional documents such as the Declaration of Independence and the Preamble to the Constitution. As such, more reminders are provided of the serious purpose of the military profession and the role in defending the Constitution.

Emphasis on Character Development. This attribute is the most important in this thesis. The emphasis on character development, or lack thereof, within the initiatives has been supported in previous chapters to be critically important in these type of values-related initiatives. One of the major differences between the initiatives is the overriding purpose that almost every initiative had, to improve the character of Air Force personnel. The single exception to this is the current Air Force initiative.

The current initiative recognizes "that some character development probably will take place in the wake of our efforts to weave the Core Values into all education and operations, but that will be a happy by-product and not a strategic goal" (*Air Force Core Values—Guru's Guide*, Chapter VI:3). This goes against many of the other previous initiatives whose primary goal has been to improve character. It also certainly goes directly against the philosophies of Dr. Deming and Dr. Covey who stress that it is critical to first fix the individual before you can expect improvements in the organization to be made. Additionally, no explanation is provided as to why character development is so critical at the Air Force Academy but not throughout the Air Force.

The basic premise that is made in the current initiative that "presupposes that our people are good already," *(Air Force Core Values—Guru's Guide,* Chapter VI:3), is not consistent with the findings of the Josephson study that indicate we have a growing problem. This statement minimally merits further clarification and more likely re-assessment.

Emphasis on Fixing Organization. The only initiative that emphasized fixing the organization is the current Core Value initiative. No other reference was found in any of the other initiatives related to fixing organizations. Several well renowned authors, Dr. Deming and Dr. Covey, recognized that organizations could be fixed; however, only after the organization's people had been "fixed." Dr. Deming believed this, since people are the ones who make the organization's policies and procedures in the first place.

Even the documentation on the initiative itself (*The United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet* and the *Guru's Guide*) provide mixed signal in terms of an individuals role in attaining our Core Values to the organization's role. On the one hand the *Guru's Guide* states that, "Only human beings can recognize and follow values" and then several sentences later the *Guru's Guide* that even though some of the viewpoints "hint at the assumption that the Core Values initiative aims at fixing people by engineering the organization's culture. Nothing could be further from the truth" (*Air Force Core Values—Guru's Guide,* Chapter VI:3). This apparent inconsistency also merits further clarification and more likely reassessment.

Spiritual Emphasis. This attribute becomes important based on the writings of previously referenced individuals who have stated that the spiritual dimension is important when trying to inculcate values through a character development program. As might be

expected since the current Air Force Core Values initiative states that character development is not a goal, practically no reference is made to religious or spiritual aspects with the exception of such statements as "regardless of our religious views, [we] must recognize their functional importance and accept them for that reason*" (The United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet*). This is not the case in the other initiatives.

As mentioned above, different initiatives included references to different documents when explaining the Core Values. The Air Force Academy and the 1993 Core Values Program both include the commissioning oath. Other documents that are also referenced by one of the two documents include the enlistment oath, the Declaration of Independence and the Honor Oath. In the case of the three oaths, each ends with the clause, "So help me God." A portion of the Declaration of Independence that is included in the 1993 pamphlet states "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights.…" The Air Force Academy identified the importance of spiritual values and beliefs as one of their Character Development Outcomes and developed a separate strategic plan to help accomplish this outcome.

Previous historical initiatives also allowed the chaplains the opportunities to communicate moral and religious teachings as was their function.

Tone of Associated Pamphlet and Supporting Material. This difference deals with the overall aspect of how strongly each initiative was mandated. What was the tone of each initiative, was it directive or suggestive? The most recent initiative had the strongest directive approach among the initiatives. One such statement was:

> It should always be remembered **that this is not a values clarification exercise**. The Secretary and Chief of Staff have clarified the Core Values for us. The purpose of these directed discussions is for students to

> discover the relevance and importance of the Air Force Core Values. *There are correct answers, and those answers are found in the Air Force Core Values*. (*Guru's Guide,* Appendix 3:4)

Other statements were provided that showed the directive nature of the initiative. Discussions on how the values tell us the price of admission to the Air Force itself and that if we cannot live up to these values we need to separate from the service or that the *Little Blue Book* is the final authority to all disputes, all provide examples of the directive nature of the initiative.

It was made clear, however, in the four-day guru training session, that this initiative is not trying to change people, but rather identify the important values of the Air Force that Air Force personnel need to maintain. Stated another way, the Air Force was not trying to change people, but rather the Air Force only wants to employ individuals that already have or can accept these Core Values.

The tone of the previous Program was much "softer." There were statements within the *Foundations for Quality: Air Force Core Values* pamphlet that made it clear that "Values cannot be imposed" (19). Other statements within this document include, "We hope you will use it to work through the process of thinking about and developing a plan for more effectively living core values as a member of the United States Air Force" (1) and under the conclusion section, "We encourage you to take time to think seriously about what you have been presented here, discuss it with your friends and associates,…" (20).

Attendance at previous Air Force values-related initiatives (generally lectures) was mandatory, and therefore directive, for almost all personnel up to 1966 when changes were made that changed the requirements so that only personnel in basic training,

technical schools, the officer candidate school, and WAF instruction were mandated to attend.

The policies at the Air Force Academy are very directive in nature. The Honor System and Honor Code are fully explained to all cadets so that they understand what is required of them as well as the enforcement process.

Basis/Foundation of Respective Chosen Values. The biggest difference in this attribute is that the strategy for the current Core Values initiative places more emphasis on whether a value "functionally" works than whether it is an ethical value, one where there is a right and wrong. The strategy states that it "attempts no explanation of the origin of the Values except to say that all of us, regardless of our religious views, must recognize their functional importance and accept them for that reason" (*The United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet)*. This type of statement can quickly get the attention of many who may tie these values to a spiritual basis. The initiative certainly leaves the possibility open that the basis for these values is religious in nature but that is as far as it goes.

The other initiatives, with the possible exception of Values Clarification, all had positive references to spiritual aspects in some form or another. With the possible exception of the Air Force Academy, little documentation was gathered from any of the previous initiatives that explicitly tied the respective initiative to any firm basis or foundation. There were implicit statements throughout and according to interviews, the chaplains were known to share their beliefs in many of their lectures. In the case of the 1993 Core Values Program, the chaplains developed and were identified to teach portions of the training. There were also several references to God in their supporting material.

The other initiatives also had chaplain involvement and much of the training involved lessons in morals, character guidance and other spiritual related topics.

The bottom line is that even though the current initiative clearly avoids the issue of suggesting what the basis for the three identified Core Values is, no documentation from any of the other initiatives explicitly identified its basis either. There were, however, more references to ethical values and behavior in the other initiatives. The 1993 Core Values Program and Joint Publication 1 both identified moral courage as an important core value. Joint Publication 1 defines moral courage as the "willingness to stand up for what we believe is right even if that stand is unpopular or contrary to conventional wisdom" (Joint Publications 1:II-2). This clearly is quite different from doing what you think works and is "functional." It encourages soldiers to balance this functional perspective with what they believe is the right thing to do. In any other reference where this functional military rationale was found, there was also documentation stating that the decision should also be ethical. For example, concerning West Point's Honor system it was concluded that "Thus, the Honor System has its roots in ethical considerations and in practical military necessity" (1948:2-3). The Air Force Academy documentation is also very consistent in their teaching that their cadets need to do the "right" thing, despite the cost.

This author found no fault or shortcomings in explaining the functional importance of any of the respective values, but where there was concern was where the current initiative relied exclusively on the functional rationale and other ethical considerations were not sufficiently addressed. This was what was inconsistent with the other initiatives as they provided more emphasis on this other ethical dimension.

Supporting Role/Advisor to the Commander on Initiative. Up until the 1993 program, chaplains were almost exclusively responsible for advising the commander concerning these values-related initiatives. The 1993 program began to diversify this responsibility by adding additional functions such as social actions officers and individuals working with quality initiatives. Throughout Air Force history, the commanders continue to have full responsibility as they have always had, but under the current initiative they now rely on individuals other than the chaplains to advise them in the Core Values initiative. These individuals are referred to as "gurus." The gurus come from many different functional areas of expertise, including individuals with quality backgrounds, personnel backgrounds and many others. Chaplains can be identified as an organizations guru, should an organization have a chaplain and so choose to identify them, but the fact remains that chaplains do not continue to play the role that they have had over the past fifty years. While the impact of this change remains to be seen, this fact provides support questioning the first assumption identified in the *United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet*, stating that this initiative does not compete with Chapel programs. While it is true that other Chapel programs continue and have been unaffected by this initiative, in the past chaplains would have been one of several primary players in such an initiative that deals with values of Air Force personnel. It seems reasonable to this author that the chaplains are best "functionally" prepared to teach the subject of values, particularly ethical values involving right and wrong. We would not typically ask for any volunteer from an organization to come explain how best to design a weapon system. On the contrary, we would probably ask for a qualified individual with an engineering background to lead this discussion and provide what information they could from their professional

background. Until recently, the Air Force had followed this trend concerning the teaching of values. Also, by not including the chaplains in this initiative, the chaplains lose one of their best opportunities to be out in front of the people attempting to inculcate Air Force personnel with the values that senior leadership has identified as important.

The Number of Values Identified in Each Initiative. The difference here while very clear does not appear to be very significant. The previous Program, under General McPeak, identified six Core Values, whereas the current initiative streamlined these down to three. There was no official rationale provided for this change. Some believed that limiting the Core Values to three was just an effort to assist in making it easier to remember the Core Values. Regardless of the true reason, the change from six to three does not appear to have any significant impact on the initiative. The three Core Values identified can be defined so broadly that many other values are encompassed within them as discussed is done in *The United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet.*

Research Question 4

What have these related initiatives emphasized with respect to character development and the role of the chaplain in conducting the respective training?

Emphasis on Character Development

In reference to character development, each of the three external organizations, the Covey Leadership Center, the Character Education Partnership (CEP) and the Josephson Institute of Ethics, believe that character development is fundamental. Quotations were provided from several military heroes and commanding generals also emphasizing the importance of character in leaders. The Air Force Academy also identifies character as "central" to tomorrow's Air Force leaders. With the primary exception of the current

initiative, all previous Air Force initiatives have at least implicitly attempted to improve the character of Air Force personnel. As was stated previously under research question number three, the strategy that the current initiative is taking concerning fixing the organization first, certainly goes directly against the philosophies of Dr. Deming and Dr. Covey who stress that it is critical to first fix the individual before you can expect improvements in the organization to be made.

Some might argue that the current initiative is in reality also concerned with and making an effort to improve the character of its personnel. This author would not argue with this assessment based on all of the references that are made to how "we, the people" need to accept these values, realizing full well that this initiative states very explicitly that this is not its intent. Another example of one of many statements that was made that could confuse someone as to what the intent of the initiative really is, is the quote referenced earlier that was made by General Fogleman in the *Air Force Times* article. General Fogleman summarized the initiative by stating, "The bottom line is that our ongoing efforts in the areas of core values are motivated by the desire to inculcate service values in our people via an organized and systematic process throughout their careers" (March 17, 1997:37). One could certainly understand if someone took this to mean what it seems to say, that the Air Force is interested in inculcating values in its people, not organizations.

In summary, all previous initiatives have emphasized the importance of character development. The current initiative fits the description of character development used throughout, but emphasized fixing the organization. This appears to demand review by the "process owners" of the current initiative and further clarified.

Role of the Chaplain

With respect to the role of the chaplain, their utilization in initiatives such as this has changed significantly over time. Although their early direction was clear, to act as "advisor to the commanding officer on all matters pertaining to the religious life, morals, and character building factors within a given command" (Jorgensen, 1961:62), what has happened over time is that this role has in many cases been over or under delegated. The role of the chaplain has essentially gone from developer and facilitator of discussions and lectures to not having a role at all in the current initiative. Based on the documentation reviewed, up until the 1993 program the chaplains were the primary player in these values-related initiatives. Even in 1993, the intent was to continue to utilize the chaplains in a supporting role. There is no identified role for the chaplain in the current initiative.

It is not the intent of this research to draw any conclusions from that finding but merely to identify it as a significant change over time. No factual rationale was identified. Others can provide further research as to why the changing chaplain role or more importantly, what the chaplain's role ought to be.

Additional Findings

In addition to identifying the previous values-related initiatives and programs that have existed in the Air Force since its creation and the associated differences between these programs, this study also identifies a number of issues that need further clarification.

Areas Needing Further Clarification

It is important here to provide a reminder that was also referenced to in Chapter II. Since this research was primarily exploratory, many of the findings and observations were

classified in the category of "needs further clarification." It is important that the reader not misinterpret the issues/differences categorized in the "needs further clarification" category as being neutral. In reality they may be very significant It must be remembered that it was not the objective of this research to make an assessment of which initiative was best, rather just that a difference exists. In most cases, the Core Values Working Group and the ArchConCom which were identified in Chapter IV will be the groups that need to assess and clarify these issues.

The areas needing further clarification that have been identified in this study include:

Should the Air Force place more emphasis on making decisions based on them being ethical rather than just functional? The current initiative provides no explanation of the origin the three identified values. It places the vast majority of its rationale for why we need to accept these values on the statement that they are functionally important in the military environment. While other sources have recognized the need this functional need, they all also emphasize that decisions also need to be morally and ethically right.

Given that this effort is really interested in developing character, should not the Air Force emphasize the spiritual dimension in a positive way? Although the initiative denies that it has set the goal of developing character, this study has provided evidence that indicates that the initiative may really be interested in developing character, in so much as most of the references in the *United States Air Force Core Values Pamphlet* are addressed towards a change in people, not organizations.

Given that the initiative is interested in character development, there has been much written on the importance of not degrading the relevance of religion when teaching values.

Who should this initiative include? And if the Air Force initiative is going to include civilians and contractors, how can the Air Force better incorporate training not in the current plan? Historically, the Air Force mandated that all personnel attend these lectures and programs. Then the Air Force backed off that position and only required particular individuals in training to attend. Today, the initiative again is focused on all Air Force employees, including civilians and contractors. If the Core Values are to apply to all Air Force personnel, which seems reasonable to this author, it would serve the Air Force to develop a more involved plan as to how it plans to provide the necessary training to all groups of individuals, including civilians and contractors.

The continuation weave will allow civilians to become familiar with the Core Values initiative if their chain-of-command follows through and civilians are also permitted and even encouraged to pursue professional military education (PME) where Core Values will be taught, but in reality few civilians attend PME and therefore the overall plan for civilians does not appear adequate. This author found no data providing evidence of any planning for contractor training.

Should the initiative's tone be directive or suggestive? Quite a difference existed between the two most recent initiatives. The 1993 Core Values Program was very suggestive in nature and encouraged Air Force personnel to consider the information that had been presented. It also stated and worked under the premise that "values cannot be imposed." The current Core Values initiative is very directive in nature. It states that all Air Force personnel must accept these values or else it is suggested that they should find a different profession in which to work.

Given that our society generally believes that senior leadership needs to identify what is important to an organization, like its vision, mission, and core values, where is the line drawn to how they then require acceptance versus strive to receive buy-in from the employees.

Why does not the Air Force use the Air Force Academy as the benchmark or lead the force example? Is there a logical explanation why the Air Force has not adopted more of the approaches and policies of the Air Force Academy, especially since the three Core Values have been adopted by the Air Force as a whole. The lessons provided throughout their curriculum on the subject of character development is probably the place to start. The Academy has developed eight outcomes to measure their success in developing character amongst it cadets. Although these data and the relationship between cadets and the remainder of Air Force personnel need to be appropriately filtered, the Academy seems like an appropriate organization as a baseline for lessons learned.

How will the Air Force know when it has achieved its goal? In other words, how will values be measured? This is an important question for any initiative. Granted, measuring an improvement in an individual's values or an organization's values seems even more difficult than other measurements. To even establish an original baseline of what the values of an organization are seems equally difficult.

Is the basic premise that is made in the current initiative that "presupposes that our people are good already" valid? Some would argue that this premise is flawed. If it is true, we probably do not need to focus our attention on character development. Simply fixing the organization's processes could provide a less tempting environment in which to work. This premise goes against the findings of the Josephson Institute of Ethics

and Dr. Deming's belief that since people are the creators of the process, if we really want to improve the process we need to improve the individual.

Suggestions for Future Research

Future research could be conducted for all of attributes that were classified as needing further clarification. Differences have been shown to exist between the different values-related initiatives but little attempt has been made in this effort to determine which initiative, based on its strategy, was more effective.

Another related area where future research could be conducted is in the assessment of the effectiveness of the Academy's programs and how these current programs and initiatives at the Academy can be "repackaged" as appropriate and transferred to the entire Air Force. There does not seem to be any other organization that has more applicability to the values that are demanded of Air Force personnel than the United States Air Force Academy.

Related to this is the question concerning who the initiative should apply to. Future research could be conducted to clarify this issue. Questions such as: Do civilians have or require the same values as the military members? Do more senior level individuals have higher values than junior individuals and therefore not need the same amount of values training as the younger employees? How do industry and other organizations teach core values? How can the Air Force best provide the necessary values training to DOD civilians as well as contractors? These and many other questions related to the subject of who the initiative applies to and how it should be implemented could be addressed.

Summary

Values-related initiatives and programs aimed at improving character had existed in this country for several decades before the creation of the USAF in 1947. They have continued to exist since that time and a linkage has been established in this study back to 1947. Without assessing the relative successes of any of them, what is important is that character has been recognized and established as more important in military leadership than competency. While strategies have differed over the past two decades concerning the need to emphasize ethical values (values clarification), currently the importance of the ethics of right and wrong deserves equal merit with the functional explanation. The current initiative differs from previous values-related initiatives in several ways that have been identified in this study. This research has called into question two of the primary assumptions of the current initiative.

It is hoped that by further examination and additional research, the emphasis on character development, the emphasis placed on fixing organizations first, and the lack of emphasis on the spiritual dimension and the role of the chaplain will be reassessed. It is also believed that future research in the areas identified as needing further clarification will provide additional insight into how best to effectively implement a core values program.

Lastly, it was recommended that the USAF Academy should represent the continuing "Lead the force" activity for character development efforts within the Air Force. This is not the first time that this idea had been suggested, as General Hosmer has recently stated, "We then set out to develop methods to make the Academy a model for character development for the entire Air Force."

Final Thoughts

The Core Values initiative appears to be a necessary attempt by the Air Force to identify standards that organizationally will not be compromised and provide the road signs of ethical behavior for all individuals to accept and follow. While two of the assumptions are called into question by this research, along with several areas that this research shows require clarification, the initiative appears critical as part of a character development program. Such a program will require continued leadership support and emphasis that the current initiative appears to enjoy.

The process owners of this initiative, which emanated at the Air Force Academy, should continue to look at the Academy for continuing evolution and assessment of the character development program. It would appear that lessons learned there could be more realistically applied to the rest of the Air Force community, officers, enlisted and civilian. Obviously, further discussions will need to take place to determine the degree to which the Academy's initiatives are appropriate for the remainder of Air Force personnel.

Lastly, the Air Force should recognize that most past initiatives surely faced and failed in the real battle, "the clash between intent and practical execution." My firm hope is that this effort helps lead to success.

Bibliography

Air Education & Training Command. AETC Instructor Guide-IG, *Core Values*, July 1993.

Air Education & Training Command. *Foundations For Quality: Air Force Core Values—Personal Applications Handbook*, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1993.

Air Force Core Values, Guru's Guide, Version 1.0. (http://usafa.af.mil/core-value/).

Alexander, Marian. "Character Development Program." United States Air Force Academy. Point Paper. 5 April 1994.

Andrus, Burton C. *25th Anniversary Pictorial Review of the United States Air Force Academy, 1954 to 1979*. U.S. Air Force Academy CO: Association of Graduates, 1979.

Billman, Ed. Air Force Quality Council Working Group Member at AETC for 1993 Core Values Program, Air Education and Training Command, Randolph AFB TX. Personal interview. 17, 22 July 1997.

Brende, Otis A. *A Pilot Study on the Relationships Between Personal Values and Quality of Life*. MS Thesis, AFIT/GSM/SM/76S-2. School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, September 1975. (No Ad number assigned).

Carter, Stephen L. *The Culture of Disbelief*. New York NY: BasicBooks, 1993.

Center For Character Development. *United States Air Force Academy Character Development Manual*. May 1994.

Character Education Partnership, Inc. *Character Education in U.S. Schools: The New Consensus—A Report on Developments During 1993-1995*. Alexandria VA, February 1996.

Civil Air Patrol, *Values for Living and Ethics for Command*. Maxwell Air Force Base AL: National Headquarters Civil Air Patrol, 1 December 1996.

Code of Federal Regulation, Title 3—The President, 1943-1948 Compilation, 835-836.

Code of Federal Regulation, Title 3—The President, 1949-1953 Compilation, 231.

Colson, Charles W. "A Question of Ethics," *Airpower Journal, X*, No. 2, Summer 1996: 4-12.

Covey, Stephen R. *Principle Centered Leadership*. New York NY: Simon & Schuster, 1992.

Covey, Stephen R. *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People*. New York NY: Simon & Schuster, 1989.

Dalbey, Stephen B. *A Pilot Study of the Personal Value Systems of United States Air Force Officers*. MS Thesis, AFIT/GSM/SM/72-4. School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, December 1972 (AD-754163).

Deming, W. Edward. *Out of the Crisis*. Cambridge MA, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1982.

Department of the Air Force. *United States Air Force Core Values*. 1 January 1997.

Department of Defense, *Joint Publication 1 (Joint Warfare of the Armed Services of the United States)*. 10 January 1995.

Dethloff, Frank R. and Dennis E. Doucet. *A Study of Pilots' Value Systems and Their Effect on Career Intentions*. MS Thesis, AFIT/LSSR 29-78B. School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, September 1978 (ADA061342).

Dunford, Douglas. Current Core Values Initiative Co-administrator, Air Education and Training Command. Randolph AFB TX. Personal interview. 16-17 July 1997.

Fogleman, Ronald R. "Core Values Revisited," *Air Force Times*, March 17, 1997: 37.

Funk, Charles E. *Funk & Wagnalls New College Standard Dictionary*. New York NY, Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1956.

Groh, John E. Air Force Chaplains Volume IV, *Air Force Chaplains 1971-1980*. Washington DC, Office Chief of Air Force Chaplains, 1986.

Groh, John E. USAF Chaplain Service Volume V, *Facilitators of the Free Exercise of Religion 1981-1990*. Washington DC, Office Chief of Chaplains, USAF, 1991.

Hall, Brian F. and David A. Wagie, "The US Air Force Academy's Cutting-Edge Character Development Program," *Airpower Journal*, *X*, No. 2, Summer 1996: 35-39.

Heim, Robert L. *Leadership Decision Making and the Judeo-Christian Ethic*. MS Thesis, US Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth KA, 1993 (AD-A273-013).

Hosmer, Bradley C. "View From the Top," *Checkpoints Magazine*, Association of Graduates of the US Air Force Academy, *23*, No 1, Spring 1994: 7.

Jorgensen, Daniel B. Air Force Chaplains Volume II, *Air Force Chaplains 1947-1960*. Washington DC, Office Chief of Air Force Chaplains, 1961.

Josephson, Michael. *Ethical Values, Attitudes, and Behaviors in American Schools*. Marina del Ray CA: Josephson Institute of Ethics, 1992.

Kilpatrick, William K. *Why Johnny Can't Tell Right From Wrong*. New York NY: Simon and Schuster Inc., 1993.

Ledford, Tranette. "Ministering the Force," *Army Times*, May 19, 1997: 12-14.

Lewallen, Robert D. "Sex, Power, and Ethics: The Challenge to the Military Professional," *Airpower Journal*, *V*, Fall 1991, No. 3: 57-65.

Lickona, Thomas. "The Return of Character Education," *Educational Leadership*, November 1993: 6.

Marumoto, Glen S. *The Study of Personal Values of Selected Senior U.S. Army and U.S. Air Force Officers*. MS Thesis, AFIT/GLM/LSR/88S-44. School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, September 1988 (AD-A201580).

Matthews, William. "Soul Searching, Fogleman Presses the Air Force to Check its Moral Compass," *Air Force Times*, February 24, 1997: 12-16.

McCosh, Carol E. *The Value Hierarchies of Selected Air Force Officers*. MS Thesis, AFIT/GLM/LSH/86S-48. School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, September 1986 (AD-A174087).

Naworol, Raymond L. *Robert E. Lee: Character Centered Leadership*. MS Thesis, US Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth KA, 02 Jun 1995 (AD-A299-272).

Nord, Warren A. *Religion and American Education—Rethinking a National Dilemma*. Chapel Hill NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1995.

Palmer, David G. *A Code of Ethics for Air Force Officers*. US Army War College, Carlisle Barracks PA, 26 March 1973 (AD-911-116).

Peters, Thomas J. and Robert H. Waterman, Jr. *In Search of Excellence*. New York NY, Warner Books, 1982.

Price, Rita A. *The Quest For Moral Fiber at the Precommissioning Level*. US Army War College, Carlisle Barracks PA, 15 April 1996 (ADA-309-657).

Rehberg, Carl D. "Ethics and Character Development in Government Organizations," unpublished paper, HQ USAF/REXP, Washington DC, August 1994.

Roberts, Alexander B. "Core Values in a Quality Air Force: The Leadership Challenge," *Airpower Journal*, Summer 1994: 40-53.

Scharlemann, Martin H. Air Force Chaplains Volume III, *Air Force Chaplains 1961-1970*. Washington DC, Office Chief of Air Force Chaplains, 1971.

United States Air Force Academy. *Annual Report of the Superintendent—Fiscal Year 1966*. August 1966: 39-40.

United States Air Force Academy. *Annual Report of the Superintendent—Fiscal Year 1966*. August 1970: 51-52.

United States Air Force Academy Professional Development Program—Deputy Commandant for Military Instruction, Class of 1995, *Second Class Cadet Study Guide*. Fall Semester 1993.

United States Military Academy. *Annual Report of the Superintendent—1 July 1969 - 30 June 1970*. West Point NY: 32.

United States Military Academy. *Annual Report of the Superintendent—1 July 1970 - 30 June 1971*, West Point NY: 37.

United States Military Academy. *Annual Report of the Superintendent—1 July 1971 - 30 June 1972*, West Point NY: 36-37).

United States Military Academy. *The Annual Report of the Superintendent—1 July 1972—30 June 1973*, West Point NY: 37-38).

United States Military Academy. *The Annual Report of the Superintendent—1 July 1969—30 June 1970*, West Point NY.

Wallisch, Bill. "Four Pillars of Excellence," *Air Force Magazine*, April 1984: 94-97.

Wenker, Kenneth H. *Ethics in the Air Force: 1988*, Department of the Air Force: 1988. Maxwell Air Force Base AL, Air University Press, February 1990.

White, Jerry E. "Personal Ethics versus Professional Ethics," *Airpower Journal*, *X*, No. 2, Summer 1996: 30-34.

Willis, G. E. "In the Midst of Scandals, Army Leadership Wants Its Soldiers to Instill Ideals in Their Lives. What Does That Mean?," *Army Times*, June 16, 1997: 12-14.

Yin, Robert K. *Case Study Research—Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications, 1994.

Zielinski, Constantine E. "Eternal Faith in a World of Change," *Air Force Magazine*, June 1959: 91-92.